Agenda<br>Planning Commission<br>City Of Edina, Minnesota<br>City Hall, Council Chambers

Tuesday, October 25, 2022
7:00 PM

# Watch the meeting on cable TV or at EdinaMN.gov/LiveMeetings or Facebook.com/EdinaMN. 

Participate in Community Comment and Public Hearings<br>Call 786-496-5601<br>Enter Conference Pin 8550148\#<br>Press *1 on your telephone keypad when you would like to get in the queue to speak An operator will introduce you when it is your turn

I. Call To Order
II. Roll Call
III. Approval Of Meeting Agenda
IV. Approval Of Meeting Minutes
A. Draft Minutes of Regular Meeting September 28, 2022
B. Draft Minutes of Regular Meeting October 12, 2022
V. Community Comment

During "Community Comment," the Board/Commission will invite residents to share relevant issues or concerns. Individuals must limit their comments to three minutes. The Chair may limit the number of speakers on the same issue in the interest of time and topic. Generally speaking, items that are elsewhere on tonight's agenda may not be addressed during Community Comment. Individuals should not expect the Chair or Board/Commission Members to respond to their comments tonight. Instead, the Board/Commission might refer the matter to staff for consideration at a future meeting.
VI. Public Hearings
A. Site Plan Review and Ordinance Amendment - 4901 West 77th Street
B. Subdivision with Lot Area, Width and Depth Variances - 6416 McCauley Circle
VII. Chair And Member Comments

## VIII. Staff Comments

## IX. Adjournment

The City of Edina wants all residents to be comfortable being part of the public process. If you need assistance in the way of hearing amplification, an interpreter, large-print documents or something else, please call 952-927-8861 72 hours in advance of the meeting.


## CITY OF EDINA

## 4801 West 50th Street

Edina, MN 55424
www.edinamn.gov

Date: October 25, 2022
Agenda Item \#: IV.A.
To: Planning Commission
Item Type:
Minutes
From: Liz Olson, Administrative Support Specialist
Subject: Draft Minutes of Regular Meeting September 28, 2022

## Item Activity:

Action

## ACTION REQUESTED:

Approve the draft minutes from September 28, 2022.

## INTRODUCTION:

## ATTACHMENTS:

$\qquad$ , 2022

Minutes
City Of Edina, Minnesota
Planning Commission
Edina City Hall Council Chambers September 28, 2022

## I. Call To Order

Chair Agnew called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

## II. Roll Call

Answering the roll call were: Commissioners Miranda, Strauss, Gandhi, Alkire, Olsen, Padilla, Smith, and Chair Agnew. Staff Present: Cary Teague, Community Development Director, Liz Olson, Administrative Support Specialist.

Absent from the roll call: Commissioner Bennett.

## III. Approval Of Meeting Agenda

Commissioner Strauss moved to approve the September 28, 2022, agenda. Commissioner Padilla seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

## IV. Approval Of Meeting Minutes

A. Minutes: Planning Commission, September 14, 2022

Commissioner Smith moved to approve the September 14, 2022, meeting minutes. Commissioner Alkire seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

## V. Community Comment

None.

## VI. Public Hearings

## A. Comprehensive Plan Amendment, Rezoning and Site Plan with Multiple Variances -

 6106 Vernon AvenueDirector Teague presented the request of 6106 Vernon Avenue for a Comprehensive Plan Amendment, Rezoning and Site Plan with Multiple Variances. Staff recommends denial of the Comprehensive Plan Amendment, Rezoning and Site Plan with Multiple Variances, as requested subject to the findings and conditions listed in the staff report.

Staff answered Commission questions.
$\qquad$ 2022

## Appearing for the Applicant

Mr. Chris Davis, 6637 Parkwood Road, Edina, Special X Properties addressed the Commission and answered questions of the Commission.

Mr. Marty Collins, Special $\times$ Properties, addressed the Commission on different possible entities for the property.

## Public Hearing

Mr. Matthew Pepper, 6004 Eden Prairie Road, addressed the Commission and indicated he was against this proposal.

Ms. Tracy Pepper, 6004 Eden Prairie Road, addressed the Commission and indicated she was also against this proposal.

Mr. Jeff Knapp, Parkwood Condominiums, 6005 Eden Prairie Road \#207, addressed the Commission and suggested another alternative use for the property.

Mr. Samuel Reed, 6012 Eden Prairie Road, addressed the Commission and stated he was not in favor of this proposed development.

Ms. Nancy Sheer, 6105 Eden Prairie Road, addressed the Commission and stated she was opposed to the proposed development.

Ms. Joanne Dudek, 6021 Vernon Avenue, addressed the Commission and stated was against the proposed development.

Ms. Sara Irwin, 6025 Kamar Drive, addressed the Commission and explained she was not in favor of this proposal.

Mr. John Wellborn, 6008 Eden Prairie Road, addressed the Commission and indicated he was against this proposed development.

Mr. Jeremie Kass, 6016 Kamar Drive, addressed the Commission and stated his family was against this proposal.

Mr. Todd Young, 55II Highwood Drive W., addressed the Commission and indicated being an architect he was against this proposed development.

Mr. Scott Forbes, 6101 Saxony Road, addressed the Commission and explained he was fundamentally against this proposal.
$\qquad$

Ms. Mary Kenealy-Bredice, 6020 Kamar Drive, addressed the Commission and indicated she was against the proposed development.

Mr. Marty Collins, 6104 Jeffrey Lane, addressed the Commission and explained he was in favor of this development. He reviewed some other types of businesses that could go onto the property.

Mr. Tom Kohlbry, 6004 Kamar Drive, addressed the Commission and indicated he was against this proposed development.

Ms. Sue Ettinger-Levy, 6102 Arctic Way, addressed the Commission and indicated she was in support of this proposed development.

Ms. Heidi Moon, 6009 Leslee Lane, addressed the Commission and explained she was in support of the development.

Mr. Bobby McConnell, 6029 Kamar Drive, addressed the Commission and stated he was in support of this proposed development.

Mr. Etienn Laubignat , 6028 Kamar Drive, addressed the Commission and indicated he was in support of this development.

Mr. Terry Brown, Blake Ridge Townhomes, addressed the Commission and explained he was adamantly opposed to this development.

## Commissioner Miranda moved to close the public hearing. Commissioner Olson seconded the motion. Motion carried.

The Commission discussed the proposed development and asked staff questions.

- The number and degree of the variances suggested are unusual and are too many
- The Comprehensive Plan is old for this site but is not outdated
- The Comprehensive Plan is consistent with the land use next door
- Parking was supposed to reflect the maximum number of staff which seemed very low
- Concerned with parking, delivery issues, trash, and noise late at night with the bar
- Concerned about the traffic in the afternoon with children in the area
- The proposed restaurant development does not fit into the neighborhood
- No mention of sustainability in the plans
- Would like to separate dumpsters for recycling and trash
- The proposed development is too much for the site with all of the variances needed
- Site is too small for the idea presented

The Commission concurred on denial of the proposed development.
$\qquad$ 2022

## Motion

Commissioner Alkire moved that the Planning Commission recommend denial to the City Council of the Comprehensive Plan Amendment, Rezoning and Site Plan with Multiple Variances as outlined in the staff memo subject to the conditions and findings therein. Commissioner Padilla seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

The Planning Commission meeting can be viewed online at the City website.
The Commission took a two-minute recess to clear the chamber.

## VII. Chair and Member Comments

Received.

## VIII. Staff Comments

Received.

## IX. Adjournment

Commissioner Alkire moved to adjourn the September 28, 2022, Meeting of the Edina Planning Commission at 9:30 PM. Commissioner Olson seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.


## CITY OF EDINA

## 4801 West 50th Street

Edina, MN 55424
www.edinamn.gov

Date: October 25, 2022
Agenda Item \#: IV.B.
To: Planning Commission
Item Type:
Minutes
From: Liz Olson, Administrative Support Specialist
Subject: Draft Minutes of Regular Meeting October 12, 2022

## Item Activity:

Action

## ACTION REQUESTED:

Approve the draft minutes from October 12, 2022.

## INTRODUCTION:

## ATTACHMENTS:

Draft Planning Commission Minutes 10-12-22
$\qquad$ 2022

Minutes
City Of Edina, Minnesota
Planning Commission
Edina City Hall Council Chambers
October I2, 2022

## I. Call To Order

Chair Agnew called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

## II. Roll Call

Answering the roll call were: Commissioners Miranda, Strauss, Gandhi, Alkire, Bennett, Padilla, Olson, and Chair Agnew. Staff Present: Cary Teague, Community Development Director, Emily Bodeker, Assistant Planner and Liz Olson, Administrative Support Specialist.

Absent from the roll call: Commissioner Smith and Hu.

## III. Approval Of Meeting Agenda

Commissioner Alkire moved to approve the October I2, 2022, agenda. Commissioner Padilla seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

## IV. Community Comment

None.

## V. Public Hearings

## A. B-22-I8, A 10 Foot Height Variance for a Freestanding Sign - 7777 Washington

 Avenue SAssistant Planner Bodeker presented the request of 7777 Washington Avenue South for a IO-foot height Variance for a freestanding sign at the subject property. Staff recommended approval of the 10 -foot height variance for a freestanding sign, as requested, subject to the findings and conditions listed in the staff report.

Staff answered Commission questions.

## Appearing for the Applicant

The applicant was at the meeting but did not speak.

## Public Hearing

$\qquad$

None.

Commissioner Miranda moved to close the public hearing. Commissioner Padilla seconded the motion. Motion carried.

The Commission discussed the proposed variance.

## Motion

Commissioner Miranda moved that the Planning Commission recommend of the 10 Foot Height Variance for a Freestanding Sign at 7777 Washington Avenue South as outlined in the staff memo subject to the conditions and findings therein. Commissioner Padilla seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

## B. B-22-I7, a Parking Variance - 7429 Bush Lake Road

Director Teague presented the request of 7429 Bush Lake Road for a parking variance. Staff recommends approval of the parking variance, as requested subject to the findings and conditions listed in the staff report.

Staff answered Commission questions.

## Appearing for the Applicant

Mr. Sean Ewen, Co-Founder and President of Wooden Hill Brewing Company, addressed the Commission.

## Public Hearing

None.

Commissioner Alkire moved to close the public hearing. Commissioner Olson seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

The Commissioner discussed the proposed parking variance.

## Motion

Commissioner Olson moved that the Planning Commission recommend approval of the parking variance at 7429 Bush Lake Road as outlined in the staff memo subject to the conditions and findings therein. Commissioner Strauss seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

## VII. Reports/Recommendations

A. Sketch Plan Review - $\mathbf{4 2 1 2}$ and $\mathbf{4 2 1 6}$ Valley View Road

Director Teague presented the request for a sketch plan review.
$\qquad$ 2022

Staff answered Commission questions.

## Appearing for the Applicant

Mr. Steve Behnke and Paul Donnay, 6605 Mohawk Trail, addressed the Commission.
The Commission asked questions of the applicant.
The Commission reviewed the sketch plan and offered the following comments:

- Does not like the design of the front-loaded garages
- Wish there was an alley
- Would be interested seeing six units rather than five to help with affordability and density
- Would like to see missing middle housing rather than all of the driveways

The entire meeting can be viewed on the City website.

## B. Status Update for Commissioners on 2022 Work Plan Progress

Chair Agnew asked Commissioners for a status update on their progress for their 2022 work plan. The lead Commissioners reviewed their work plans.

## VIII. Correspondence and Petitions

None.

## IX. Chair and Member Comments

None.

## X. Staff Comments

Received.

## XI. Adjournment

Commissioner Padilla moved to adjourn the October 10, 2022, Meeting of the Edina Planning Commission at 8:38 PM. Commissioner Alkire seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.


## CITY OF EDINA

4801 West 50th Street<br>Edina, MN 55424

www.edinamn.gov

Date: October 25, 2022
Agenda Item \#: VI.A.
Item Type:
Report and Recommendation
From: Cary Teague, Community Development Director
Subject: Site Plan Review and Ordinance Amendment - 4901
Item Activity:
Action

## ACTION REQUESTED:

Recommend the City Council approve the site plan and ordinance amendment regarding signage.

## INTRODUCTION:

First Bank and Trust is proposing to build a 15,000 square foot office and bank with an interior drivethrough at the vacant site at 4901 77th Street West within Pentagon Village. The request requires a site plan review and ordinance amendment to allow an interior facing sign. (See attached plans and narrative.)

Pentagon Village is a 12.5 -acre site that is zoned PUD-17. The subject property is Lot 4 within the overall master plan that called for a future 19,000 square foot office/retail building. The proposed building is generally within the same building pad. (See the attached approved overall master plan for Pentagon Village.)

The request requires the following:

1. Site Plan review; and
2. Ordinance amendment to allow interior facing signage.

## ATTACHMENTS:

Staff Report
Proposed Plans
Applicant Narrative
Applicant Narrative - Signs
Original Pentagon Park Approval - Master Plan
Traffic and Parking Study

Draft Ordinance
Approved Master Plan for Pentagon Village
Better Together Public Hearing Comment Report

## Staff Presentation

Applicant Presentation

Date: October 25, 2022

To: Planning Commission

From: Cary Teague, Community Development Director

Subject: Site Plan Review \& Ordinance Amendment - 490I West 77 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street

## Information / Background:

First Bank and Trust is proposing to build a 15,000 square foot office and bank with an interior drive-through at the vacant site at 4901 77th Street West within Pentagon Village. The request requires a site plan review and ordinance amendment to allow an interior facing sign. (See attached plans and narrative.)

Pentagon Village is a 12.5 -acre site that is zoned PUD-I7. The subject property is Lot 4 within the overall master plan that called for a future 19,000 square foot office/retail building. The proposed building is generally within the same building pad. (See the attached approved overall master plan for Pentagon Village.)

The request requires the following:
I. Site Plan review; and
2. Ordinance amendment to allow interior facing signage.

The proposed site plan has not changed from the original approval. The site has already been graded and is ready for construction of a building. Internal drive aisles/road and parking lots have not changed. The footprint of the building and building height are generally the same as the approved master plan.

## SUPPORTING INFORMATION

## Surrounding Land Uses

Northerly: Multi-family residential and retail; zoned MDD-6, Mixed Development District and guided OR, Office Residential.
Easterly: Office/light industrial uses; zoned PID, Planned Industrial District and guided OR, Office Residential.
Southerly: City of Bloomington.
Westerly: Highway 100.

## Existing Site Features

The subject site within the Pentagon Village PUD, is vacant and relatively flat.

## Planning

Guide Plan designation: Office/Residential (20-75 residential units per acre)
Zoning: PUD-I7, Planned Unit Development District-I7

## Site Circulation/Traffic

The proposal would not change the vehicular or pedestrian circulation of the overall development plan for Pentagon Village. Vehicle access would be by the interior roadway. There would be sidewalks provided on all three sides of the building.

WSB conducted traffic studies for this development. The studies concluded that the existing roadways can be supported by the project, and no roadway improvements are necessary. (See attached traffic study.)

## Parking

When the project was approved in 2019, a parking study was done by WSB. The study determined that the amount of parking proposed within this project is adequate. There are I,422 parking stalls in the existing ramp and surface parking areas. The study concluded that I,359 spaces is adequate for the overall development. (See attached study.) The ramp and adjacent surface parking lot would serve the site. The office proposed here is slightly smaller than the anticipated office/retail use.

## Landscaping

The landscape plan is consistent with the previously approved landscape plan for the site. (See the approved overall development plan.) There would be overstory trees and a full complement of understory shrubs and bushes around the building. (See attached landscape plan.)

## Grading/Drainage/Utilities

There have been no changes to the approved plans from 2019. The city engineer has reviewed the proposed plans and found them to be acceptable. The site has already been graded for the development of this site.

## Building/Building Material

The building materials would be a combination of stone and metal panel. (See attached renderings and building materials and the previously approved plan.)

## Mechanical Equipment/Trash Enclosures

Any rooftop and/or ground level equipment and trash enclosures would have to be screened if visible from adjacent property lines. The trash area would be located within the building.

## Compliance Table

|  | PUD-17 | Proposed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Setbacks - Buildings <br> 77th Street <br> Computer Avenue <br> Normandale Boulevard <br> Viking Drive | 15 feet 15 feet 50 feet 10 Feet | 16 feet 15 feet NA NA |
| Building Height | 12 stories \& 144 feet per the height overlay district | 2 stories |
| Parking lot and drive aisle setback | 20 feet | $20+$ feet |
| Maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) | 1.5\% | 1.5\% |

## Ordinance Amendment - Wall Signage

The applicant is requesting an amendment to the PUD to allow three wall signs. (See attached building elevations showing the wall signage.) The third wall sign is the symbol of the bank above the main entry; from some angles of the building appears to be part of the "First Bank \& Trust" lettering as on the north elevation. Staff believes the request is reasonable, given the architecture of the building and its angles, and the visibility of this site within the PUD. The building is highly visible on all four sides, and the bank desires to have signage facing inward to the Pentagon Village development and parking areas as well as on the street.

## STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Recommend the City Council approve the Site Plan request and Ordinance Amendment for 4901 $77^{\text {th }}$ Street West.

Approval is based on the following findings:
I. The proposed land uses, and development meet all city code requirements.
2. The proposed plans are consistent with plans approved for this site in 2019.
3. The proposed signage is reasonable given the architecture of the building and visibility of the building on all four sides.

Approval is subject to the following Conditions:
I. The Plan must be consistent with the Plans date stamped September 26, 2022.
2. The Final Landscape Plan must meet all minimum landscaping requirements per Chapter 36 of the Zoning Ordinance. A performance bond, letter-of-credit, or cash deposit must be submitted for one and one-half times the cost amount for completing the required landscaping, screening, or erosion control measures at the time of any building permit.
3. Provision of code compliant bike racks for each use near the building entrances.
4. The Final Lighting Plan must meet all minimum requirements per Section 36-I260 of the City Code.
5. Roof-top mechanical equipment and ground level equipment must be screened per Section 36-1459 of the City Code.
6. Submit a copy of the Nine Mile Creek Watershed District permit. The City may require revisions to the approved plans to meet the district's requirements.
7. Hours of construction must be consistent with City Code.

## Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends approval of the request subject to the findings and conditions above.

## FIRST BANK \& TRUST - PENTAGON VILLAGE NEW CONSTRUCTION 4901 WEST 77TH STREET <br> EDINA, MINNESOTA

PROJECT OWNER:
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Roseville, MN 55113
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## ADJACENT SITES




JERSEY MIKE'S (VIEW FROM WEST 77TH STREET)


THE RESERVE (VIEW FROM DEVELOPMENT INTERIOR)
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EXTERIOR RENDERING AT MAIN ENTRY
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# SITE PLAN APPLICATION WRITTEN STATEMENT 

FIRST BANK \& TRUST - PENTAGON VILLAGE (NEW CONSTRUCTION)
4901 West 77th Street, Edina, MN

First Bank \& Trust is a 142-year-old, privately held community bank founded by entrepreneur Horace Fishback in Brookings, South Dakota. FB\&T is a full-service bank with $\$ 4.2 \mathrm{~B}$ in total assets. The bank serves 17 communities in South Dakota and Minnesota with 22 banking locations. FB\&T entered the Edina market in December 2017 by way of acquiring Peoples Bank of Commerce. PBC has a location at 3316 West 66th Street, Edina which it occupied since December of 2005 following a relocation from Bloomington. Today, FB\&T continues to offer banking services from the West 66th Street location. As FB\&T continues to grow and expand both services and staff in Edina and throughout the Twin Cities, it has created a need to increase the physical capacity of the branch.

Anticipating this growth, FB\&T engaged a commercial real estate broker to assist in identifying potential sites within Edina for consideration. After reviewing approximately 20 sites for compatibility with the bank's goals, this Pentagon Village location emerged as a prime opportunity to bring FB\&T's growth to the area while deepening its connection with the Edina community and offering a wealth of high-level career opportunities. FB\&T management anticipates staff increasing from 10 FTEs to approximately 20 within 12 months of commencing banking services at the proposed Edina branch. The new facility will incorporate space for FB\&T's Chief Mortgage Officer, SBA Director, Twin Cities Wealth Management team, and private banking, each of these roles new to the Edina branch. Hoping to merge this vision with the goals of Pentagon Village and the City of Edina, FB\&T began developing an all-new design incorporating the character of their existing branches in a custom-tailored approach for Pentagon Village.

The layout prioritizes a welcoming client lobby surrounded by clear glass façades and full height windows showcasing lobby and office activity. Over 30 individual workspaces fill the 20,600 square foot structure plus a 30-seat staff training facility to support existing and future Twin Cities branches, a fitness room, and other employee amenities. A compact drive-up lane supporting the bank's retail growth is an essential clientexperience feature. In the wake of COVID-19, the necessity of this element has become even more significant.

After considering numerous layouts for the site including traditional surface drive-up lanes and various configurations of shielding the lanes from view, the bank landed on a concept that A) minimized disruption of the existing parking layout, B) utilized a building footprint similar to what has already been approved for the site, and C) included a completely integrated drive-up lane enclosed within the building structure and architecturally screened from view. The bank felt this was the best approach to uphold the city and community goals for this location as well as to establish an engaging architectural presence at this focal corner of the development.

A final factor influencing the project is the exceptionally high-water table. Per the watershed district, the lowest allowable floor level is $824.8^{\prime}$, slightly above exiting parking surfaces, but nearly 6 feet above the sidewalk that begins at the northeast corner and encircles the development. The only viable point of entry was determined to be the northwest corner, accessible from the parking area. A raised tower emphasizes this location while an array of architecturally similar 'fin' features flanks the sides, visually connecting the main entry with the surrounding perimeter and guiding guests to the entrance, whichever direction they may be arriving from.

First Bank \& Trust is excited to reestablish their presence in the community with the design of this local market flagship office location. A positive recommendation from Edina's Planning Commission and an approval from the City Council will be a major step forward in bringing a vision of growth to this Edina location. First Bank \& Trust looks forward to partnering with Pentagon Village and the City of Edina to provide a design that improves upon an already thriving concept for this development.

HTG
htg-architects.com
1010 Mainstreet, Suite 100, Hopkins, MN 55343
Minneapolis | Bismarck

DATE: 09/26/2022

# ORDINANCE AMENDMENT WRITTEN STATEMENT 

FIRST BANK \& TRUST - PENTAGON VILLAGE (NEW CONSTRUCTION)
4901 West 77th Street, Edina, MN

First Bank \& Trust hereby requests consideration for an ordinance amendment intended to address a design challenge being encountered in the Pentagon Village Planned Unit Development (PUD) as it relates to office building identification. The current language of the code for this PUD simply defers to the sign codes intended for the Mixed Development District (MDD). The concern is that the typical needs of these districts may differ, and that the ordinance could be improved to recognize these differences.

As is the case with the Pentagon Village development, a PUD tends to be arranged such that buildings wrap the development perimeter while parking and other interconnecting infrastructure is centralized. As currently written, the zoning ordinance allows for a maximum of two wall signs for any given building within the development with the ordinance dictating that one wall sign is allowed per street frontage and no building, current or planned, has more than two street frontages. However, it is essential that buildings are identifiable from within the development as well and we believe this would warrant an additional signage allowance in these cases. This may be a phenomenon that is more common in PUDs given their clustered arrangement while freestanding sites more typical of MDDs may be more likely to have street frontages on more sides and less likely to require separate signage for street frontages versus building fronts and entries oriented toward a development interior.

The current text of the code supports excellent visibility and identification from outside the development assuming one sign is used to face each street frontage but does not adequately support the ability of current and future uses to be identified from within the development. This challenge is exacerbated by irregular lot perimeters such as Lot 4 , upon which First Bank \& Trust intends to build. Lot 4 follows a dog-leg shape requiring a 6 -sided building structure to fill the lot to its required density. Identification and brand presence become problematic in this case when no more than two wall signs are allowed.

This dilemma is not unique to First Bank \& Trust as it should be noted that at least two other developed lots within Pentagon Village (The Reserve and Jersey Mike's) currently exceed the signage per street frontage allowance as specified in the current ordinance. Both buildings currently have 3 total wall signs with 2 street frontage-facing signs and 1 development interior-facing sign above their respective main entries. First Bank \& Trust recommends amending the ordinance to allow the same visibility to future buildings in the same development.

## (A summary of current and proposed zoning ordinance language as it relates to this request is outlined on the

 following page)
## Original Text:

## Sec. 36-510. - Planned Unit Development District-17 (PUD-17) Pentagon Park South.

(h) Signs shall be regulated per the Mixed Development District.

## Supplementary Text for Reference:

## Sec. 36-1717. - Mixed Development District.

(5) Building identification signs: office.
a. MDD-6. One wall sign per building per frontage and one freestanding sign per building per frontage. The maximum area of the first wall sign or freestanding sign shall not exceed 50 square feet and the maximum area of each additional sign shall not exceed 36 square feet. Maximum height: eight feet.
b. MDD-3, MDD-4 and MDD-5. One building identification sign per frontage. The first sign shall not exceed 50 square feet and each additional sign shall not exceed 36 square feet. Maximum height: eight feet.

## Proposed Language to Amend the Zoning Ordinance:

## Sec. 36-510. - Planned Unit Development District-17 (PUD-17) Pentagon Park South.

(h) Signs shall be regulated per the Mixed Development District plus one additional building identification sign facing the development interior. The additional sign is not to exceed 50 square feet. Maximum height: eight feet.

## Final Development Plan Site Improvements

## Pentagon Village Edina, MN

Solomon Real Estate Group 8560 Kelzer Pond Drive
Victoria, MN 55386
Contact: Jay Scott
Phone: (651) 336-6060
Email: JayScott@solomonre.com

## Westwood
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## Memorandum

To: Mr. Cary Teague, Community Development Director City of Edina

From: $\quad$ Charles Rickart, P.E., PTOE, Project Manager WSB \& Associates, Inc.

DATE: $\quad$ May 2, 2018
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { RE: } & \text { Solomon Real Estate - South Pentagon Park Development } \\ & \text { Traffic and Parking Study } \\ & \text { City of Edina, MN } \\ & \text { WSB Project No. } 11953-00\end{array}$

## Background

The purpose of this memorandum is to document the transportation impacts from the proposed redevelopment of the Pentagon Park south area (Solomon Real Estate Group) in relationship to the approved development and mitigation from the Gateway Area, Alternative Urban Areawide Review (AUAR). The site is located on the south side of W. $77^{\text {th }}$ Street between TH 100 and Computer Avenue and is shown on the attached Figure I.

A Traffic analysis was completed in conjunction with the AUAR in 2007 which included the Pentagon Park area. The AUAR was updated in 2013 and it was concluded that because no Gateway area development had occurred in the area, and that the area traffic levels have not changed significantly from those assumed in the AUAR for the baseline conditions the future year analysis and recommended mitigation in the 2007 AUAR were still valid. AUAR updates are required every five years from the original date of the approved AUAR. Currently the second AUAR update is being prepared. Data and results from the current draft (February 2, 2018) updated AUAR Traffic Study will be used as part of this analysis. This document is attached in the Appendix.

The development of the South Pentagon Park development is planned to be completed in two phases. The first phase of the development is planned to include 346 hotel rooms in two buildings and 11,800 square feet of retail / restaurant uses. The second phase will include 225,000 square feet of office in two buildings and 19,000 square feet of retail uses. Access to the site will be from public streets and driveways off W. $77^{\text {th }}$ Street, Computer Avenue, Viking Drive and Normandale Road. The full development of the South Pentagon Park development is the subject of this Study and is shown on the attached Figure 2.
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The traffic impacts of the proposed site redevelopment were evaluated for: the existing conditions; projected 2020 the anticipated completion of the South Pentagon Park development only, and; projected 2025 and 2040 from the AUAR. The following locations were included as part of the analysis:

- France Avenue at $76^{\text {th }}$ Street
- France Avenue at Minnesota Drive
- $77^{\text {th }}$ Street at Minnesota Drive
- $77^{\text {th }}$ Street at Parklawn Avenue
- $77^{\text {th }}$ Street at Computer Avenue
- $77^{\text {th }}$ Street at Burgundy Place Driveway
- $77^{\text {th }}$ Street at SB TH 100 Ramp
- $77^{\text {th }}$ Street at NB TH 100 Ramp
- Computer Avenue at Site Access
- Computer Avenue at Viking Drive
- Viking Drive at Normandale Road
- Normandale Road at Site Access

The following sections of this report document the analysis and anticipated impacts of the proposed first phase of the South Pentagon Park redevelopment.

## Existing Traffic Conditions

Updated AM and PM peak hour turning movement counts were conducted the weeks of December $4^{\text {th }}$ and December $11^{\text {th }}, 2017$. These counts were used as the existing baseline conditions for the area. The draft updated AUAR Traffic Study in the Appendix shows the existing intersections and driveways in the Study Area, with the existing AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes.

## Background (Non-Development) Traffic Growth

Traffic growth in the vicinity of a proposed site will occur between existing conditions and any given future year due to other development within the region. This background growth must be accounted for and included in future year traffic forecasts. Reviewing the historical traffic counts in the area, traffic has stayed somewhat constant or dropped in the past few years. In order to account for other development background growth in traffic the Hennepin County State Aid traffic growth projection factor of 1.1 over a 20 -year period was used to project traffic to the 2020 analysis year. The Gateway AUAR also identified adjacent development projects in Edina and Bloomington that have yet to be completed. These developments were assumed to be completed and included in the 2025 and 2040 future full build scenarios included in the draft updated AUAR Traffic Study in the Appendix.
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## Trip Generation

The estimated trip generation from the South Pentagon Park development is shown below in Table 1 . The trip generation rates used to estimate the proposed site traffic is based on extensive surveys of the trip-generation rates for other similar land uses as documented in the Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation Mantal, $10^{\text {th }}$ Edition. The table show the total daily, AM peak hour and PM peak hour trip generation for the proposed site.

Table 1 - Estimated Trip Generation - South Pentagon Park

| Land Use | ITE <br> Code | Siz |  | Time of Day | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Trip } \\ & \text { Rate } \end{aligned}$ | Trip Generation |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | In |  | Out |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \% | Trips | \% | Trips |
| Office | 710 | 225,000 | gsf | Daily | 9.74 | 2,192 | 50 | 1,096 | 50 | 1,096 |
|  |  |  |  | AM Peak | 1.16 | 261 | 86 | 224 | 14 | 37 |
|  |  |  |  | PM Peak | 1.15 | 259 | 16 | 41 | 84 | 218 |
| Retail | 820 | 19,000 | gsf | Daily | 37.75 | 718 | 50 | 359 | 50 | 359 |
|  |  |  |  | AM Peak | 0.94 | 18 | 57 | 10 | 43 | 8 |
|  |  |  |  | PM Peak | 3.81 | 72 | 52 | 37 | 48 | 35 |
| Retail / <br> Restaurant |  | 11,800 | gsf | Daily | 112.18 | 1,324 | 50 | 662 | 50 | 662 |
|  | 932 |  |  | AM Peak | 9.94 | 117 | 55 | 64 | 45 | 53 |
|  |  |  |  | PM Peak | 9.77 | 115 | 62 | 71 | 38 | 44 |
| Hotel | 310 | 346 | rms | Daily | 8.36 | 2,892 | 50 | 1,446 | 50 | 1,446 |
|  |  |  |  | AM Peak | 0.47 | 163 | 59 | 96 | 41 | 67 |
|  |  |  |  | PM Peak | 0.6 | 208 | 51 | 106 | 49 | 102 |
| Total |  |  |  | Daily | 7,126 |  |  | 3,563 | 3,563 |  |
|  |  |  |  | AM Peak |  |  |  | 394 |  | 65 |
|  |  |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |  | 255 |  | 99 |
| Internal Trips |  |  |  | Daily |  |  |  | -398 |  | 998 |
|  |  |  |  | AM Peak |  |  |  | -48 |  | 41 |
|  |  |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |  | -56 |  | 31 |
| Net Increase in Trips |  |  |  | Daily |  |  |  | 2,665 |  | 665 |
|  |  |  |  | AM Peak |  |  |  | 346 |  | 124 |
|  |  |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |  | 199 |  | 68 |

Source: Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation Manual, I0th Edition
Based on current planes the remainder of the Pentagon Park development area is anticipated to include on the north side of W. $77^{\text {th }}$ Street; 1,250 market rate apartment units, 225 senior adult housing units and 125 affordable housing units on the Welsh Title site.

In addition, the Gateway Area AUAR assumed additional development adjacent to the Pentagon Park area, including; 519,300 sf office and, $1,296,000$ office and warehouse uses.
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The estimated trip generation from the remainder of the proposed Pentagon Park development and Gateway AUAR area is shown below in Table 2.

Table 2 - Estimated Trip Generation - Additional Gateway Area

| Land Use | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ITE } \\ & \text { Code } \end{aligned}$ | Size |  | Time of Day | Trip Rate | Trip Generation |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Total |  | In |  | Out |  |
|  |  |  |  | \% |  | Trips | \% | Trips |
| Market Rate Apartment | 221 | 1,250 | units |  | Daily | 5.44 | 6,800 | 50 | 3,400 | 50 | 3,400 |
|  |  |  |  | AM Peak | 0.36 | 450 | 26 | 117 | 74 | 333 |
|  |  |  |  | PM Peak | 0.44 | 550 | 61 | 335 | 39 | 215 |
| Senior Adult <br> Housing - <br> Attached | 252 | 225 | units | Daily | 3.7 | 832 | 50 | 416 | 50 | 416 |
|  |  |  |  | AM Peak | 0.2 | 45 | 35 | 16 | 65 | 29 |
|  |  |  |  | PM Peak | 0.26 | 59 | 55 | 32 | 45 | 27 |
| Welsh Title Site Affordable Housing | 221 | 125 | units | Daily | 5.44 | 680 | 50 | 340 | 50 | 340 |
|  |  |  |  | AM Peak | 0.36 | 45 | 26 | 12 | 74 | 33 |
|  |  |  |  | PM Peak | 0.44 | 55 | 61 | 34 | 39 | 21 |
| Office | 710 | 519,300 | gsf | Daily | 9.74 | 5,058 | 50 | 2,529 | 50 | 2,529 |
|  |  |  |  | AM Peak | 1.16 | 602 | 86 | 518 | 14 | 84 |
|  |  |  |  | PM Peak | 1.15 | 597 | 16 | 96 | 84 | 501 |
| Office and Warehousing | 150 | 1,296,000 | gsf | Daily | 1.71 | 1,516 | 50 | 758 | 50 | 758 |
|  |  |  |  | AM Peak | 0.17 | 220 | 77 | 169 | 23 | 51 |
|  |  |  |  | PM Peak | 0.19 | 246 | 27 | 66 | 73 | 180 |
| Total |  |  |  | Daily | 14,886 |  | 7,443 |  | 7,443 |  |
|  |  |  |  | AM Peak | 1,362 |  | 843 |  | 519 |  |
|  |  |  |  | PM Peak | 1,507 |  |  | 561 | 946 |  |
| Internal Trips |  |  |  | Daily | -1,208 |  |  | -604 | -604 |  |
|  |  |  |  | AM Peak | -298 |  |  | -171 | -127 |  |
|  |  |  |  | PM Peak | -269 |  |  | -98 | -171 |  |
| Net Increase in Trips |  |  |  | Daily | 13,678 |  |  | 6,839 | 6,839 |  |
|  |  |  |  | AM Peak |  |  |  | 672 | 392 |  |
|  |  |  |  | PMPeak | 1,0641,238 |  |  | 463 | 392775 |  |

[^0]The AUAR identified four potential land use scenarios that were evaluated. Trips for each of the scenarios were generated and are shown in the updated AUAR Traffic Study in the Appendix. All the proposed land use scenarios assume replacing all the existing office space.
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Table 3 shows a comparison between the current full build proposal of the area (Pentagon Park proposals both north and south of W. $77^{\text {th }}$ Street with the estimated remainder of the Gateway Area) and the AUAR Scenarios. Based on the full build of the area the current Pentagon Park proposed development would generate fewer trips than those included in the AUAR except the daily traffic for the AUAR Scenario 1 condition.

Table 3-Traffic Generation Comparison

| Scenario | ADT | AM Peak | PM Peak |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Pentagon Park Proposals w/ <br> Remainder of Gateway Area | 20,008 | 1,534 | 1,805 |
| AUAR Scenario 1 | 17,771 | 2,068 | 2,078 |
| AUAR Scenario 2 | 27,825 | 2,778 | 2,931 |
| AUAR Scenario 3 | 34,475 | 4,057 | 4,050 |
| AUAR Scenario 4 | 22,789 | 2,123 | 2,270 |

## South Pentagon Park Traffic Operations Analysis

Existing and/or forecasted traffic operations were evaluated for the impacted intersections and driveway adjacent to the proposed development. The analysis was conducted for the following scenarios.

1. Existing 2017 (in draft AUAR Traffic Study update)
2. Projected 2020 - Build South Pentagon Park Development
3. Projected 2025 - Build Full Gateway Area (in draft AUAR Traffic Study update)
4. Projected 2040 - Build Full Gateway Area (in draft AUAR Traffic Study update)

This section describes the methodology used to assess the operations and provides a summary of traffic operations for each analysis year.

## Analvsis Methodology

The traffic operations analysis is derived from established methodologies documented in the Highway Capacity Manual 2000 (HCM). The HCM provides a series of analysis techniques that are used to evaluate traffic operations.

Intersections are given a Level of Service (LOS) grade from "A" to "F" to describe the average amount of control delay per vehicle as defined in the HCM. The LOS is primarily a function of peak traffic hour turning movement volumes, intersection lane configuration, and the traffic controls at the intersection. LOS A is the best traffic operating condition, and drivers experience minimal delay at an intersection operating at that level. LOS E represents the condition where the intersection is at capacity, and some drivers may have to wait through more than one green phase to make it through an intersection controlled by traffic signals.
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LOS F represents a condition where there is more traffic than can be handled by the intersection, and many vehicle operators may have to wait through more than one green phase to make it through the intersection. At a stop sign-controlled intersection, LOS F would be characterized by exceptionally long vehicle queues on each approach at an all-way stop, or long queues and/or great difficulty in finding an acceptable gap for drivers on the minor legs at a through-street intersection.

The LOS ranges for both signalized and un-signalized intersections are shown in Figure 3. The threshold LOS values for un-signalized intersections are slightly less than for signalized intersections. This variance was instituted because drivers' expectations at intersections differ with the type of traffic control. A given LOS can be altered by increasing (or decreasing) the number of lanes, changing traffic control arrangements, adjusting the timing at signalized intersections, or other lesser geometric improvements. LOS also changes as traffic volumes increase or decrease.

## Figure 3 - Intersection Level of Service Ranges



LOS, as described above, can also be determined for the individual legs (sometimes referred to as "approaches") or lanes (turn lanes in particular) of an intersection. It should be noted that a LOS E or F might be acceptable or justified in those cases where a leg(s) or lane(s) has a very low traffic volume as compared to the volume on the other legs. For example, improving LOS on such low-volume legs by converting a two-way stop condition to an all-way stop, or adjusting timing at a signalized intersection, could result in a significant penalty for the many drivers on the major road while benefiting the few on the minor road. Also, geometric improvements on minor legs, such as additional lanes or longer turn lanes, could have limited positive effects and might be prohibitive in terms of benefit to cost.
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Although LOS A represents the best possible level of traffic flow, the cost to construct roadways and intersection to such a high standard often exceeds the benefit to the user. Funding availability might also lead to acceptance of intersection or roadway designs with a lower LOS. LOS D/E is generally accepted as the lowest acceptable level in urban areas such as Edina. LOS C is often considered to be the desirable minimum level for rural areas. LOS E/F may be acceptable in highly congested urban areas for limited durations or distances, or for low-volume legs of some intersections.

The LOS analysis was performed using Synchro/SimTraffic:

- Synchro, a software package that implements Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) methodologies, was used to build each signalized intersection and provide an input database for turning-movement volumes, lane geometrics, and signal design and timing characteristics. In addition, Synchro was used to optimize signal timing parameters for future conditions. Output from Synchro is transferred to SimTraffic, the traffic simulation model.
- SimTraffic is a micro-simulation computer modeling software that simulates each individual vehicle's characteristics and driver behavior in response to traffic volumes, intersection configuration, and signal operations. The model simulates drivers' behaviors and responses to surrounding traffic flow as well as different vehicle types and speeds. It outputs estimated vehicle delay and queue lengths at each intersection being analyzed.


## Existing Level of Service Summary

The existing intersection operations were evaluated for the AM and PM peak hour assuming the current lane geometry, traffic control and traffic volumes. The results of this analysis are found in the draft updated Traffic Study included in the Appendix. Based on the analysis, the only intersection that is operating at an overall deficient level of service (LOS E or F), is France Avenue at Minnesota Drive which is operating at an overall LOS E during the PM peak hour. All other intersections are operating at an overall LOS D or better. However, there are several movements that are operating at LOS F including:

- France Ave at W. $76^{\text {th }} \mathrm{St}-$ Northbound Left - AM Peak $=$ LOS F
- W. $77^{\text {th }}$ St at SB TH 100 Ramp - Eastbound Through - PM Peak = LOS F
- W. $77^{\text {th }}$ St at NB TH 100 Ramp - Eastbound Left - PM Peak = LOS F
- France Ave at Minnesota Dr - Westbound Left - PM Peak = LOS F


## Forecasted 2020 Traffic Operations

A capacity and LOS analysis was prepared for the study area intersections for 2020 which is assumed to the year after the proposed South Pentagon Park development would be completed. The analysis assumes full build of the South Pentagon Park development with the existing lane configurations and traffic control.

The results of the analysis are shown below in Table 4. It shows that all intersection will continue to operate at overall LOS D or better in 2020 during the AM peak hour. However, during the PM peak hour in 2020 with the increase in traffic from the proposed South Pentagon Park development some intersections and movements will be operating at LOS E/F. Specifically, the intersections of $77^{\text {th }}$ at the TH 100 ramps and France Avenue at Minnesota Street will have overall levels of service at $E$.

Table 4-Forecasted 2020 South Pentagon Park Development

| Intersection | 2020 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
|  | LOS | Delay | Movement <br> (LOS) | LOS | Delay | Movement <br> (LOS) |
| SB TH 100 at <br> W 77th St | C | 34.1 |  | E | 61.2 | EBT (F) |
| NB TH 100 at <br> W 77th St | C | 32.6 | EBR (E) | E | 64.8 | EBL (F) |
| Commercial Access at <br> W 77th St | C | 27.5 |  | D | 40.2 | NBL (E) <br> EBR (E) |
| Computer Ave at <br> W 77th St | C | 31.3 | EBR (E) | D | 41.4 | NBL (E) <br> EBR (E) |
| Parklawn Ave at <br> W 77th St | C | 24.1 |  | D | 39.7 |  |
| W 77th St at <br> Minnesota Dr | C | 21.2 |  | D | 38.1 | SBL (E) |
| France Ave at <br> W 76th St | D | 36.4 | NBL (F) | D | 42.6 |  |
| France Ave at <br> Minnesota Dr | C | 32.3 |  | E | 62.3 | WBL (F) |
| Computer Ave at <br> Site Access | A | 8.2 |  | B | 11.8 |  |
| Computer Ave at <br> Viking Drive | B | 12.4 |  | B | 14.9 |  |
| Viking Drive at <br> Normandale Rd | A | 7.6 |  | A | 9.1 |  |
| Normandale Rd at <br> Site Access | A | 6.3 |  | A | 8.4 |  |

With the addition of the South Pentagon Park development several movements will be operating at LOS E or F as outline in Table 4. In order to mitigate the unsatisfactory movements, specifically at the main access intersections for the South Pentagon Park development, the following improvements should be considered:
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- Addition of a northbound left turn lane, southbound striped left turn lane and eastbound right turn lane at $77^{\text {th }}$ Street and Commercial Access driveway
- Addition of a northbound dual left turn lane and eastbound right turn lane at $77^{\text {th }}$ Street and Computer Avenue
- Signal timing improvements/optimization on W. $77^{\text {th }}$ Street from TH 100 to Parklawn Avenue.


## Forecasted 2025 and 2040 Traffic Operations

The 2025 and 2040 intersection operations were evaluated for the AM and PM peak hour assuming the full build of the Gateway AUAR area development is completed including the Pentagon Park-development. The summary of the expected traffic operations for the key intersections for each development scenario is included in the draft updated Traffic Study in the Appendix.

The results of the analysis show that all scenarios will have some operational deficiencies in years 2025 and/or 2040. Deficiencies include operations on France Avenue, the TH 100 interchange, and accesses to the Gateway Study Area. The majority of these locations do not have right or left turn lanes or the existing turn lanes do not have adequate capacity to handle the forecast traffic volumes.

During both the AM peak hour PM peak hours in both 2025 and 2040 assuming with the increase in traffic for each land use scenario, several intersections and movements will be operating at LOS E or F. Specifically, the intersections of $77^{\text {th }}$ Street at the TH $100 \mathrm{ramps}, 77^{\text {th }}$ Street at Computer Drive, $77^{\text {th }}$ Street at Parklawn Ave, $77^{\text {th }}$ at Minnesota Drive, France Avenue at $76^{\text {th }}$ Street and France Avenue at Minnesota Street.

The AUAR identified mitigation improvements that would improve all intersections and movement to an acceptable LOS E or better depending on the development scenario included:

## 2025 Mitigation:

1. 2020 Improvement identified for the South Pentagon Park development.
2. Addition of a northbound dual right-turn lane at $77^{\text {th }}$ Street and TH 100 SB Ramp.
3. Addition of a northbound through lane at France Avenue and Minnesota Street.

## 2040 Mitigation:

1. 2025 Improvements
2. Addition of a northbound through lane at France Avenue and Minnesota Drive.
3. Addition of a southbound through lane at France Avenue and $76^{\text {th }}$ Street.
4. Addition of an eastbound and westbound third lane on $77^{\text {th }}$ Street from TH 100 SB Ramp through Computer Drive.
5. Addition of an eastbound and westbound dual left turn lane at France Avenue and Minnesota Street.
6. Addition of a southbound left turn lane at $77^{\text {th }}$ Street and Minnesota Street.
7. Addition of an eastbound right turn lane at $77^{\text {th }}$ Street and Parklawn Avenue.

## AUAR Mitigation Requirements

The AUAR completed in 2007, updated in 2013 and is currently being updated, identified several required mitigation measures to be completed at various levels and stages of development. The AUAR identified development scenarios were used to prepare the Traffic and Transportation Mitigation measures included in the draft updated Traffic Study in the Appendix.

Based on the traffic generation for the current Pentagon Park development plans including the remainder of the Gateway Area, Scenario 1 or 4 provides similar traffic conditions (see Table 3). The following mitigation measures were identified in the draft updated AUAR Traffic Study in the Appendix, for Scenarios 1 and 4 to accommodate both 2025 and 2040 traffic projections.

## Scenarios 1 and 4:

| Intersection: | France Avenue at West $76{ }^{\text {th }}$ Street |
| :---: | :---: |
| Improvement: | Extend one southbound thru lane on France Avenue to create a total of four thru lanes |
| Need By: | 2040 No-Build |
| Intersection: | Northbound TH 100 at West $77{ }^{\text {th }}$ Street |
| Improvement: | Add 150 -foot northbound right turn lane on Frontage Road Westbound dual right turn lanes on West $77^{\text {th }}$ Street |
| Need By: | 2040 Full Build |
| Intersection: | Edina Industrial Boulevard / West 78 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street |
| Improvement: | Eastbound dual left turn lanes on West $78{ }^{\text {th }}$ Street |
| Need By: | 2040 Full Build |
| Intersection: | Edina Industrial Boulevard / Metro Boulevard |
| Improvement: | Add southbound right turn lane on Metro Boulevard, restriping the existing two southbound lanes to accommodate an exclusive left turn lane, and a thru/left lane, providing dual left turn lanes. Add 300 -foot eastbound left turn lane on Edina Industrial Boulevard |
| Need By: | 2025 No-Build |
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## Parking Demand

The parking demand for the proposed South Pentagon Park development was analyzed based on the anticipated use for the site. Based on the current City Code the proposed development would require a total of 1,718 parking spaces. The current site plan includes 1,422 spaces. Table 5 shows a breakdown of the parking required per City Code for each anticipated development phase.

Based on the results of the parking analysis the spaces provided with the first phase of the development will meet City Code. However, with the addition of the second phase of development or assuming the full development the site does not meet City Code. A 296-space parking variance would be required for the site development with the current plan.

Table 5-Parking Required per City Code

| Use | Size | Rate | Parking Required | Parking Provided |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hotel | 346 Rooms / 50 Employees | 1/room $+1 / \mathrm{employee}$ | 396 | 550 |
| Retail / <br> Restaurant | Rest $=7,000 \mathrm{sf} / 120$ seats <br> /10employees <br> Retail $=4,800 \mathrm{sf}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Rest }=1 / 3 \text { seats }+1 / \text { employee } \\ \text { Retail }=8 / \text { first } 1000 \mathrm{sf}+ \\ 6 / \text { additional } 1000 \mathrm{sf} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 81 | 113 |
| Total Parking Phase 1 |  |  | 477 | 663 |
| Office | 225,000 sf | 1/200sf | 1,125 | 718 |
| Retail | 19,000 sf | $\begin{gathered} \text { Retail }=8 / \text { first } 1000 \mathrm{sf}+ \\ 6 / \text { additional } 1000 \mathrm{sf} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 116 | 41 |
| Total Parking Phase 2 |  |  | 1,241 | 759 |
| Total South Pentagon Park Parking |  |  | 1,718 | 1422 |

Source: City of Edina
The parking demand was also analyzed based on industry standards. The parking generation rates used to estimate the parking demand was based on surveys of the parking generation for other similar land uses as documented in the Institute of Transportation Engineers Parking Generation Manual, $4^{\text {th }}$ Edition. Table 6 below shows the estimated parking generation rate and the anticipated peak parking demand on a typical weekday. This would represent the worst-case conditions for the parking of the site.

Comparing the provided parking stalls to the industry standard (ITE Rates) the first phase has an adequate number of stalls. Comparing the provided parking stalls to the industry standard the second phase would be short parked by 77 stalls. However, comparing the total number of stalls for the full build the site to the industry standard, an adequate number of stalls would be provided.
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Table 6 - Site Parking Demand per ITE

| Use | Size | Rate | Parking <br> Required |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hotel | 346 Rooms | $1.2 / \mathrm{room}$ | 415 |
| Retail $/$ <br> Restaurant | Rest $=7,000 \mathrm{sf}$ <br> Retail $=4,800 \mathrm{sf}$ | Rest $=13.3 / 1000 \mathrm{sf}$ <br> Retail $=3.16 / 1000 \mathrm{sf}$ | 108 |
| Total Parking Phase $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{5 2 3}$ |  |  |
| Office | $225,000 \mathrm{sf}$ | $3.45 / 1000 \mathrm{sf}$ | 776 |
| Retail | $19,000 \mathrm{sf}$ | Retail $=3.16 / 1000 \mathrm{sf}$ | 60 |
| Total Parking Phase 2 |  | $\mathbf{8 3 6}$ |  |
| Total South Pentagon Park Parking | $\mathbf{1 3 5 9}$ |  |  |

Source: Institute of Transportation Engineers Parking Generation Manual, 4th Edition

## Conclusions / Recommendation

Based on the analysis documented in this memorandum, WSB has concluded the following:

- The proposed South Pentagon Park development includes: 346 hotel rooms in two buildings; 11,800 square feet of retail / restaurant uses; 225,000 square feet of office in two buildings, and; 19,000 square feet of retail uses. The site is anticipated to generate an additional 6,330 daily trips, 470 AM peak hour trips and 567 PM peak hour trips.
- The remainder of the Pentagon Park development on the north side and south side of W. $77^{\text {th }}$ Street and the remainder of the Gateway Area AUAR development area site is anticipated to generate 13,678 daily trips, 1,069 AM peak hour trips and 1,238 PM peak hour trips.
- The full build of the area with the current proposed Pentagon Park development will generate fewer trips than any of the land use scenarios included in the AUAR except the daily traffic for the Scenario 1 condition.
- A draft updated Traffic Study has been prepared for the Gateway Area AUAR. This document was used as the baseline for the existing conditions and projected 2025 and 2040 conditions. The document is included in the Appendix of this memorandum.
- The existing operations analysis shows that the only intersection which is operating at an overall deficient level of service (LOS E or F), is France Avenue at Minnesota Drive which is operating at an overall LOS E during the PM peak hour. All other intersections are operating at an overall LOS D or better.
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- The forecasted 2020 traffic operations with the South Pentagon Park development shows that all intersection will continue to operate at overall LOS D or better during the AM peak hour. However, during the PM peak hour some intersections and movements will be operating at LOS E/F. Specifically, the intersections of $77^{\text {th }}$ at the TH 100 ramps and France Avenue at Minnesota Street will have overall levels of service at E.
- With the addition of the South Pentagon Park development by 2020 several movements will be operating at LOS E or F. In order to mitigate the unsatisfactory movements, turn lane and traffic signal timing improvements at the W. $77^{\text {th }}$ Street/Commercial Access driveway and $\mathrm{W} .77^{\text {th }}$ Street/Computer Avenue intersection would be needed.
- The Gateway Area AUAR completed in 2007, updated in 2013 and is currently being updated, which included the Pentagon Park development area identified several required mitigation measures to be completed at various levels and stages of development for each land use scenario.
- The full build traffic generation for proposed Gateway area including the current Pentagon Park development most closely represents the AUAR land use Scenario 1 and 4. The AUAR mitigation for these Scenarios was assumed for the 2025 and 2040 forecasted conditions.
- The parking shown on the current site plan does not meet the City's Code for the proposed uses. The current plan provides for 1,422 parking spaces with 1,718 required by City Code. Based on the ITE parking generation estimates the total parking needed for the proposed uses on the site would be 1,359 . This represents the worst-case condition and therefore the proposed parking would be adequate for this site, requiring a parking variance.

Based on these conclusions the following is recommended with the development of the North Pentagon Park first phase:

1. Addition of a northbound left turn lane, southbound striped left turn lane and eastbound right turn lane at $77^{\text {th }}$ Street and Commercial Access driveway.
2. Addition of a northbound dual left turn lane and eastbound right turn lane at $77^{\text {th }}$ Street and Computer Avenue
3. Review the traffic signal timing and coordination of the signal systems on W. $77^{\text {th }}$ Street from the TH 100 ramps to Parkland Avenue.
4. Secure a 296 -space parking variance for the full site development.
5. As development continues on the remainder of the Pentagon Park site prepare traffic analysis to identify the required mitigation from the Gateway AUAR.

Solomon South Pentagon Park Development - Traffic and Parking Study
City of Edina
May 2, 2018
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## INTRODUCTION / BACKGROUND

The original Alternative Urban Areawide Review (AUAR) was completed and approved in September 2007 and analyzed the impacts of the four development scenarios for the years 2014 and 2030. The analysis for both years assumed a 1\% per year growth in general background traffic, the approved development in the Cities of Bloomington and Edina at that time and the proposed Gateway Development traffic.

AUAR updates are required every five years from the original date of the approved AUAR. The first AUAR update was prepared and approved in June 2013. This included updating the traffic counts at selected intersection and roadway segments on $77^{\text {th }}$ Avenue. The updated traffic counts were then compared to those assumed in the 2007 AUAR to determine if the analysis and recommended mitigation measures were still valid. Based on the facts that: no Gateway Development had occurred in the area; most of the additional development has been in Bloomington and Edina and their traffic generation was included in the new 2013 traffic counts; and, the area traffic levels had not changed significantly from those assumed in the original AUAR for the baseline conditions, it was concluded that the future year analysis and recommended mitigation was still valid and no additional analysis was completed.

The second AUAR update is currently being prepared. In order to update and document the impact the proposed redevelopment of the Gateway AUAR Area adjacent to W. $77^{\text {th }}$ Street between TH 100 and Parklawn Avenue has on the area traffic operations; this Traffic Impact Study is being prepared. The project location is shown on the attached Figure 1.

The following sections of this report document the analysis and anticipated impacts of the proposed Gateway AUAR development area.
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## EXISTING TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

In order to evaluate the existing conditions, key roadway segments and intersections were selected that are expected to provide the primary access to the regional roadway system when the Study Area redevelops. This section documents the existing land use, geometry, traffic volumes, and functional class at these locations, and uses these traffic characteristics to estimate their existing traffic operations.

## A. Key Roadways

The following five roadways were selected as the key roadway segments for the Study Area:

- Edina Industrial Boulevard/West $77^{\text {th }}$ Street from Metro Avenue to Computer Avenue
- West $77^{\text {th }}$ Street from Computer Avenue to Parklawn Avenue
- Minnesota Drive from West $77^{\text {th }}$ Street to France Avenue
- Parklawn Avenue/West $76^{\text {th }}$ Street from West $77^{\text {th }}$ Street to France Avenue
- France Avenue from West $76^{\text {th }}$ Street to Minnesota Drive

The transportation characteristics for the roadways are displayed in Table 1. The existing roadway segment is documented, along with the existing functional classification. Also displayed are average annual daily traffic (AADT) volumes were obtained from Year 2016 MnDOT Traffic Flow Maps.

Table 1: Characteristics of Key Roadways

| Segment | Location | Functional <br> Classification | Facility Type | Existing <br> AADT |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Edina Industrial Blvd <br> $/$ W. $77^{\text {th }}$ Street | Metro Blvd to <br> Computer Dr | A Minor Arterial - <br> Reliever | Four-Lane with <br> Turn Lanes | 12,000 |
| W. $77^{\text {th }}$ Street | Computer Dr to <br> Parklawn Ave | A Minor Arterial - <br> Reliever | Four Lane with <br> Center Turn Lane | 11,500 |
| Parklawn Avenue <br> $/$ W. $76^{\text {th }}$ Street | W. $77^{\text {th }}$ St to <br> France Ave | A Minor Arterial - <br> Reliever | Four-Lane | 8,700 |
| Minnesota Drive | W. $77^{\text {th }}$ St to <br> France Ave | Other Minor <br> Arterial | Four Lane with <br> Turn Lanes | 7,500 |
| France Avenue | W. $76^{\text {th }}$ St to <br> Minnesota Dr | A Minor Arterial - <br> Reliever | Seven Lane with <br> Turn Lane | 30,000 |

Source: 2016 MnDOT Traffic Flow Maps and 2008 Edina Comprehensive Plan
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## B. Key Intersection

The following eight intersections, displayed on Figure 2 were selected because they provide primary access to the regional roadway system from the Study Area:

- Southbound TH 100 at West 77th Street
- Northbound TH 100 at West 77th Street
- Commercial Access at West 77th Street
- Computer Avenue at West 77th Street
- Parklawn Avenue at West 77 th Street
- West 77th Street at Minnesota Drive/Johnson Avenue
- France Avenue at West 76th Street
- France Avenue at Minnesota Drive

The existing lane configurations at each of the study area intersection are as follows:
W. $77^{\text {th }}$ Street at TH 100 Southbound Ramp/Frontage Road - Traffic Signal Control SB TH 100 Ramp approaching $77^{\text {th }}$ St - one free right, one through, two left NB Frontage Road approaching $77^{\text {th }} \mathrm{St}$ - one right, one through, one left EB $77^{\text {th }}$ St approaching TH 100 NB Ramp - one right/through, one through, one left WB 77 th St approaching TH 100 SB Ramp - one free right, two through, one left
W. $7^{\text {th }}$ Street at TH 100 Northbound Ramp/Frontage Road - Traffic Signal Control SB TH 100 Ramp approaching 77th St - one free right, one through, two left NB Frontage Road approaching 77th St - one right/through, two left
EB $77^{\text {th }}$ St approaching TH 100 NB Ramp - one right/through, one through, one left WB $77^{\text {th }}$ St approaching TH 100 SB Ramp - one right, two through, one left
W. $77^{\text {th }}$ Street at Burgundy Place - Traffic Signal Control

SB Driveway approaching 77th St - one right/through, one left
NB Driveway approaching 77th St - one right/through, one left
EB 77 th St approaching Driveway - one right/through, one through, one left
WB $77^{\text {th }}$ St approaching Driveway - one right/through, one through, one left
W. $7^{\text {th }}$ Street at Computer Avenue - Traffic Signal Control

SB Driveway approaching $77^{\text {th }}$ St - one right, one through/left
NB Computer Ave approaching 77 th St - one right, one through/left
EB $77^{\text {th }}$ St approaching Computer Ave - one right/through, one through, one left
WB 77th St approaching Computer Ave - one right/through, one through, one left
W. 77th Street at Parklawn Avenue - Traffic Signal Control

SB Parklawn Ave approaching $77^{\text {th }} \mathrm{St}$ - one right, one right/through, one left
NB Driveway approaching $77^{\text {th }}$ St - one right/through/left
EB $77^{\text {th }}$ St approaching Parklawn Ave - one right/through, one through, one left
WB 77 th St approaching Parklawn Ave - one right/through, one through, one left
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W. $7^{\text {th }}$ Street at Minnesota Drive - Traffic Signal Control

SB 77th St approaching Minnesota Dr - one right/through, one through/left
NB 77 th St approaching Minnesota Dr - one free right, one through, one left
EB Driveway approaching $77^{\text {th }}$ St - one right/through, one through/left
WB Minnesota Dr approaching $77^{\text {th }} \mathrm{St}$ - one free right, one through, one left
France Avenue at 76 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street - Traffic Signal Control
SB France Ave approaching $76^{\text {th }} \mathrm{St}$ - one free right, three through, one left
NB France Ave approaching $76^{\mathrm{th}}$ St - one free right, four through, one left
EB $76{ }^{\text {th }}$ St approaching France Ave - one free right, two through, two left
WB $76^{\text {th }}$ St approaching France Ave - one free right, two through, two left
France Avenue at Minnesota Drive - Traffic Signal Control
SB France Ave approaching Minnesota Dr - one free right, four through, one left
NB France Ave approaching Minnesota Dr - one free right, three through, one left
EB Minnesota Dr approaching France Ave - one free right, two through, one left
WB Minnesota Dr approaching France Ave - one free right, two through, one left
The majority of traffic exiting and entering the study area will use at least one of these intersections. The a.m. and p.m. peak hour turn movements, lane geometry, and traffic control are displayed on Figure 3A and Figure 3B in the Appendix.

All analyzed intersections are controlled by traffic signals. For purposed of analysis, traffic signal timing was obtained from MnDOT, Hennepin County, and the City of Edina.

## C. Existing Traffic Volumes

Updated AM and PM peak hour turning movement counts were conducted the weeks of December $4^{\text {th }}$ and December $11^{\text {th }}, 2017$. These counts were used as the existing baseline conditions for the area. Figure $3 A$ and Figure $3 B$ in the Appendix shows the existing intersections and driveways in the Study Area that were analyzed as part of this traffic study, with the existing AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes,

## Draft



## Draft

## D. Existing Land Use

The existing land use consists mostly of office and office/warehouse uses. Currently about $1,736,000 \mathrm{gsf}$ of building space is available within the Study Area, of which approximately $190,000 \mathrm{gsf}$ of office space is unoccupied. Sense the original AUAR was completed the Pentagon Tower building were torn down. Building areas were measured from aerial photographs. The amount of unoccupied space was estimated by the City of Edina.

The existing land use including the estimated trip generation is calculated and shown in Table 2. As shown, the Study Area is currently generating approximately 13,000 vehicle trips per day (vpd). If the office space was fully occupied, the Gateway Study Area has the potential to generate $14,900 \mathrm{vpd}$.

Table 2: Existing Area Trip Generation

| Development | Size | Occupancy | Time of Day | Trip Rate | Trip Generation |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Total | In |  | Out |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \% | Trips | \% | Trips |
| Pentagon Quads | 355,054 gsf | 50.0\% | Daily | 9.74 | 1,729 | 50 | 865 | 50 | 864 |
|  |  |  | AM Peak | 1.16 | 206 | 86 | 177 | 14 | 29 |
|  |  |  | PM Peak | 1.15 | 204 | 16 | 33 | 84 | 171 |
| Pentagon East | 136,611 gsf | 91.0\% | Daily | 9.74 | 1,211 | 50 | 606 | 50 | 605 |
|  |  |  | AM Peak | 1.16 | 144 | 86 | 124 | 14 | 20 |
|  |  |  | PM Peak | 1.15 | 143 | 16 | 23 | 84 | 120 |
| Other Office | 992,700 gsf | 100.0\% | Daily | 9.74 | 9,669 | 50 | 4,835 | 50 | 4,834 |
|  |  |  | AM Peak | 1.16 | 1,152 | 86 | 991 | 14 | 161 |
|  |  |  | PM Peak | 1.15 | 1,142 | 16 | 183 | 84 | 959 |
| Other Office / Warehousing | 207,000 gsf | 100.0\% | Daily | 1.74 | 360 | 50 | 180 | 50 | 180 |
|  |  |  | AM Peak | 0.17 | 35 | 77 | 27 | 23 | 8 |
|  |  |  | PM Peak | 0.19 | 39 | 27 | 11 | 73 | 28 |
| Other Mini Storage | $45,000 \mathrm{gsf}$ | 100.0\% | Daily | 1.51 | 68 | 50 | 34 | 50 | 34 |
|  |  |  | AM Peak | 0.1 | 5 | 60 | 3 | 40 | 2 |
|  |  |  | PM Peak | 0.17 | 8 | 47 | 4 | 53 | 4 |
| Total |  |  | Daily | 13,037 |  | 6,520 |  | 6,517 |  |
|  |  |  | AM Peak | 1,542 |  | 1,322 |  | 220 |  |
|  |  |  | PM Peak | 1,536 |  | 254 |  | 1,282 |  |

Source: ITE Trip Generation Manual ( $10^{\text {th }}$ Edition) and WSB \& Associates, Inc.
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## TRAFFIC PROJECTIONS

In order to analyze the lane configuration and traffic control needs projected traffic volumes were determined for the area. Traffic forecasts were prepared for the year 2025 which is the year the proposed site is anticipated to be fully developed and; for the 2040 conditions which represents the City's Comprehensive Plan development time frame. The following sections outline the traffic generation, as well as the traffic distribution and projected traffic volumes.

## A. Background (Non-Development) Traffic Growth

Traffic growth in the vicinity of a proposed site will occur between existing conditions and any given future year due to other development within the region. This background growth must be accounted for and included in future year traffic forecasts. Reviewing the historical traffic counts in the area, traffic has stayed somewhat constant or dropped in the past few years.

The Gateway AUAR identified adjacent development projects in Edina and Bloomington that have yet to be completed. These developments for the projects in Edina and Bloomington are shown in Table 3. In order to account for these and other development background growth in traffic the Hennepin County State Aid traffic growth projection factor of 1.1 over a 20 -year period was used to project traffic to the 2025 and 2040 analysis years.
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Table 3: Summary of Adjacent Redevelopment Proposals

| City | Development | Summary of Impacts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bloomington | Duke-Weeks Realty Limited Partnership (Norman Pointe) | Phase 1 and 2 completed. Phase 3 to add an additional $312,000 \mathrm{sq}$. ft . of office in the future |
|  | Ryan Companies US, Inc. (Marketpoint) | Phase 1 and 2 completed. Phase 3 to add an additional $250,000 \mathrm{sq}$. ft . of office in the future. |
|  | 8100 Office Tower | $255,000 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ of office - Future |
|  | Hotel | 100 Rooms - Future |
|  | OATI Office/Data Center | $100,000 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ of office - Future |
|  | Hotel | 257 Rooms - Future |
|  | Norman Pointe III Office Tower | $312,000 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ Office - Future |
|  | Marketpoint III Office Tower | $250,000 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ Office - Future |
| Edina | 6500 France Avenue (Aurora on France) | 180 units of senior housing \& 7 care suites |
|  | Southdale Medical Building | 60,000 s.f. medical office addition and new parking ramp |
|  | 66 West (3330 $66^{\text {th }}$ Street - Affordable Housing project | 39 units |
|  | The Millennium (3250 66 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street) | 230 units of apartments |
|  | Envi Edina (3200 Southdale Circle) | 190 units of apartments |
|  | Homewood Suites Hotel at Southdale | 150 rooms |
|  | The Onyx (6725 York) | 240 units of apartments |
|  | Southdale One Apartments at Southdale | 232 units of apartments |
|  | Byerly's Redevelopment (71 France) | 234 units of housing 47,000 s.f. new Byerly's <br> 21,000 s.f. new retail <br> 9,000 s.f. Think Bank |
|  | Continental Gardens (7001 York) | 100 senior housing |
|  | Restoration Hardware at Southdale | 58,000 s.f. furniture store and restaurant |
|  | Lifetime Fitness | Replacement of 247,000 s.f. JCPenney 120,000 s.f. Lifetime Fitness 65,000 s.f. Retail |
|  | Shake Shack at Southdale | 4,000 s.f. restaurant |
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## B. AUAR Area Scenario Trip Generation

The purpose of this section is to identify the traffic impacts associated with the future redevelopment within the AUAR Study Area. Four potential land use scenarios were evaluated. Trips for each of the scenarios were generated and distributed on the regional system and analyzed for years 2025 and 2040.

In order to estimate the traffic generated by the Study Area, land use assumptions were applied to trip generation rates from the ITE Trip Generation Manual (10 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Edition) as illustrated in Table 4 to Table 7. All of the proposed scenarios replace existing office space. Trips generated from the existing buildings were shown previously in Table 2. These trips were removed from the network before applying the new land uses. It should be noted only the portion of space that is currently occupied was taken into consideration.

Scenario 1 consists of office and office/warehouse land uses. See Figure 4. This scenario is taken from the Edina Comprehensive Plan. The plan will generate approximately $17,800 \mathrm{vpd}$. The net increase equates to $4,700 \mathrm{vpd}$ with about 550 trips during each of the a.m. and p.m. peak hours.

Scenario 2 adds residential, retail, and a hotel, increasing the production to about $30,900 \mathrm{vpd}$. However, the proposed retail will be developed to serve the residential. See Figure 5. To account for trips traveling from the residential to the retail, internal trips were taken into account. Using estimates from the manual, about 3,100 trips were considered internal and removed from the net. The net increase in vehicle trips is $14,800 \mathrm{vpd}$ with 1,300 during each of the a.m. and p.m. peak hours.

Scenario 3 produces the largest number of trips, at about 34,500 trips per day due to the large amount of office space. The net increase is $21,400 \mathrm{vpd}$ with about 2,500 trips during each of the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. See Figure 6.

Scenario 4 includes office, office/warehousing, and residential uses creating 23,000 trips per day. For reasons described above under Scenario 2, about 190 internal trips were removed. The net increase in vehicle trips is $9,700 \mathrm{vpd}$ with 600 and 700 trips during the a.m. and p.m. peak hour, respectively. See Figure 7.
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Table 4: Estimated Trip Generation - Scenario 1

| Land Use | ITE <br> Land <br> Use <br> Code | Size | Time of Day | Trip Rate | Trip Generation |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | n |  | ut |
|  |  |  |  |  | Total | \% | Trips | \% | Trips |
| Office | 710 | 1,593,000 gsf | Daily | 9.74 | 15,516 | 50 | 7,758 | 50 | 7,758 |
|  |  |  | AM Peak | 1.16 | 1,848 | 86 | 1,589 | 14 | 259 |
|  |  |  | PM Peak | 1.15 | 1,832 | 16 | 293 | 84 | 1,539 |
| Office and Warehousing | 150 | 1,296,000 gsf | Daily | 1.74 | 2,255 | 50 | 1,128 | 50 | 1,127 |
|  |  |  | AM Peak | 0.17 | 220 | 77 | 169 | 23 | 51 |
|  |  |  | PM Peak | 0.19 | 246 | 27 | 66 | 73 | 180 |
| Total |  |  | Daily | 17,771 |  | 8,886 |  | 8,885 |  |
|  |  |  | AM Peak | 2,068 |  | 1,758 |  | 310 |  |
|  |  |  | PM Peak | 2,078 |  | 359 |  | 1,719 |  |
| Net Increase in Trips |  |  | Daily | 4,734 |  | 2,366 |  | 2,368 |  |
|  |  |  | AM Peak | 526 |  | $436$ |  | 90 |  |
|  |  |  | PM Peak | 542 |  | 105 |  | 437 |  |

Source: ITE Trip Generation Manual (10 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Edition) and WSB \& Associates, Inc.
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Table 5: Estimated Trip Generation - Scenario 2

| Land Use | ITE <br> Land <br> Use <br> Code | Size |  | Time of Day | Trip Rate | Trip Generation |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | In |  | Out |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \% | Trips | \% | Trips |
| Office | 710 | 1,908,000 |  | Daily | 9.74 | 18,584 | 50 | 9,292 | 50 | 9,292 |
|  |  |  |  | AM Peak | 1.16 | 2,213 | 86 | 1,903 | 14 | 310 |
|  |  |  |  | PM Peak | 1.15 | 2,194 | 16 | 351 | 84 | 1,843 |
| Office and Warehousing | 150 | 1,296,000 |  | Daily | 1.74 | 2,255 | 50 | 1,128 | 50 | 1,127 |
|  |  |  |  | AM Peak | 0.17 | 220 | 77 | 169 | 23 | 51 |
|  |  |  |  | PM Peak | 0.19 | 246 | 27 | 66 | 73 | 180 |
| Retail | 814 | 80,000 |  | Daily | 63.47 | 5,078 | 50 | 2,539 | 50 | 2,539 |
|  |  |  |  | AM Peak | 3.18 | 254 | 57 | 145 | 43 | 109 |
|  |  |  |  | PM Peak | 6.84 | 547 | 52 | 284 | 48 | 263 |
| Hotel | 310 |  | rooms | Daily | 8.36 | 1,254 | 50 | 627 | 50 | 627 |
|  |  |  |  | AM Peak | 0.47 | 71 | 59 | 42 | 41 | 29 |
|  |  |  |  | PM Peak | 0.6 | 90 | 51 | 46 | 49 | 44 |
| Condominium / Townhome | 230 | 205 | units | Daily | 7.32 | 1,501 | 50 | 751 | 50 | 750 |
|  |  |  |  | AM Peak | 0.46 | 94 | 23 | 22 | 77 | 72 |
|  |  |  |  | PM Peak | 0.56 | 115 | 63 | 72 | 37 | 43 |
| Senior Adult Housing Attached | 252 | 615 | units | Daily | 3.7 | 2,276 | 50 | 1,138 | 50 | 1,138 |
|  |  |  |  | AM Peak | 0.2 | 123 | 35 | 43 | 65 | 80 |
|  |  |  |  | PM Peak | 0.26 | 160 | 55 | 88 | 45 | 72 |
| Total |  |  |  | Daily | 30,948 |  | 15,475 |  | 15,473 |  |
|  |  |  |  | AM Peak | 2,975 |  | 2,324 |  | 651 |  |
|  |  |  |  | PM Peak | 3,352 |  | 907 |  | 2,445 |  |
| Internal Trips |  |  |  | Daily | $-3,123$ |  | -1,561 |  | -1,562 |  |
|  |  |  |  | AM Peak | -197 |  | -112 |  | -85 |  |
|  |  |  |  | PM Peak | -421 |  | -219 |  | -202 |  |
| Net Increase in Trips |  |  |  | Daily | 14,788 |  | 7,394 |  | 7,394 |  |
|  |  |  |  | AM Peak | 1,236 |  | 890 |  | 346 |  |
|  |  |  |  | PM Peak | 1,395 |  | 434 |  | 961 |  |

Source: ITE Trip Generation Manual ( $10^{\text {th }}$ Edition) and WSB \& Associates, Inc.

## Draft



## Draft

Table 6: Estimated Trip Generation - Scenario 3

| Land Use | ITE Land Use Code | Size |  | Time of Day | Trip Rate | Trip Generation |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | n |  | ut |
|  |  |  |  | Total |  | \% | Trips | \% | Trips |
| Office | 710 | 3,308,000 |  |  | Daily | 9.74 | 32,220 | 50 | 16,110 | 50 | 16,110 |
|  |  |  |  |  | AM Peak | 1.16 | 3,837 | 86 | 3,300 | 14 | 537 |
|  |  |  |  | PM Peak | 1.15 | 3,804 | 16 | 609 | 84 | 3,195 |
| Office and Warehousing | 150 | 1,296,000 | gsf | Daily | 1.74 | 2,255 | 50 | 1,128 | 50 | 1,127 |
|  |  |  |  | AM Peak | 0.17 | 220 | 77 | 169 | 23 | 51 |
|  |  |  |  | PM Peak | 0.19 | 246 | 27 | 66 | 73 | 180 |
| Total |  |  |  | Daily | 34,475 |  | 17,238 |  | 17,237 |  |
|  |  |  |  | AM Peak | 4,057 |  | 3,469 |  | 588 |  |
|  |  |  |  | PM Peak | 4,050 |  | 675 |  | 3,375 |  |
| Net Increase in Trips |  |  |  | Daily | 21,438 |  | 10,718 |  | 10,720 |  |
|  |  |  |  | AM Peak | 2,515 |  | 2,147 |  | 368 |  |
|  |  |  |  | PM Peak | 2,514 |  | 421 |  | 2,093 |  |

Source: ITE Trip Generation Manual (10 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Edition) and WSB \& Associates, Inc.

## Draft



## Draft

Table 7: Estimated Trip Generation - Scenario 4

| Land Use | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { ITE } \\ \text { Land } \\ \text { Use } \\ \text { Code } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Size |  | Time of Day | Trip Rate | Trip Generation |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | In |  | Out |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \% | Trips | \% | Trips |
| Office | 710 | 1,140,000 | gsf | Daily | 9.74 | 11,104 | 50 | 5,552 | 50 | 5,552 |
|  |  |  |  | AM Peak | 1.16 | 1,322 | 86 | 1,137 | 14 | 185 |
|  |  |  |  | PM Peak | 1.15 | 1,311 | 17 | 223 | 83 | 1,088 |
| Office and Warehousing | 150 | 1,296,000 | gsf | Daily | 1.74 | 2,255 | 50 | 1,128 | 50 | 1,127 |
|  |  |  |  | AM Peak | 0.17 | 220 | 77 | 169 | 23 | 51 |
|  |  |  |  | PM Peak | 0.19 | 246 | 27 | 66 | 73 | 180 |
| Condominium / Townhome | 230 | 1,125 | units | Daily | 7.32 | 8,235 | 50 | 4,118 | 50 | 4,117 |
|  |  |  |  | AM Peak | 0.46 | 518 | 23 | 119 | 77 | 399 |
|  |  |  |  | PM Peak | 0.56 | 630 | 63 | 397 | 37 | 233 |
| Senior Adult Housing Attached | 252 | 375 | units | Daily | 3.7 | 1,388 | 50 | 694 | 50 | 694 |
|  |  |  |  | AM Peak | 0.2 | 75 | 35 | 26 | 65 | 49 |
|  |  |  |  | PM Peak | 0.26 | 98 | 55 | 54 | 45 | 44 |
| Total |  |  |  | Daily | 22,982 |  | 11,492 |  | 11,490 |  |
|  |  |  |  | AM Peak | 2,135 |  | 1,451 |  | 684 |  |
|  |  |  |  | PM Peak | 2,285 |  | 740 |  | 1,545 |  |
| Internal Trips |  |  |  | Daily | -193 |  | -97 |  | -96 |  |
|  |  |  |  | AM Peak | -12 |  | -2 |  | -10 |  |
|  |  |  |  | PM Peak | -15 |  | -9 |  | -6 |  |
| Net Increase in Trips |  |  |  | Daily | 9,752 |  | 4,875 |  | 4,877 |  |
|  |  |  |  | AM Peak | 581 |  | $127$ |  | 454 |  |
|  |  |  |  | PM Peak | 734 |  | 477 |  | 257 |  |

Source: ITE Trip Generation Manual (10 th Edition) and WSB \& Associates, Inc.
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## C. Traffic Distribution

Background and site-generated trips were distributed to the adjacent roadway system based on several factors including the existing Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT), the travel sheds for the major routes that serve the area and data provided in the Gateway AUAR. In general, the Trip Distribution was assumed as shown in Table 8:

Table 8: Development Traffic Distribution

| Direction | AM |  | PM |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | In | Out | In | Out |
| North | $27 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $26 \%$ |
| South | $24 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $25 \%$ |
| East | $21 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $20 \%$ |
| West | $28 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $29 \%$ |

The generated trips for the proposed Gateway AUAR development area were assumed to arrive or exit using the accesses on $77^{\text {th }}$ Street. The development will access the site via Computer Drive, driveways directly onto $77^{\text {th }}$ Street and Parklawn Avenue. Background non-site and site-generated trips were distributed to the adjacent roadway system based on several factors including:

- Previous traffic and transportation studies in the area.
- Anticipated origins and destinations for specific land use (i.e. location of commercial uses in relationship to residential).
- Existing travel patterns.
- City's current Transportation Plan model.


## D. Future Year Traffic Forecasts

Future year traffic forecast turning movements were estimated by applying the approach direction distribution percentages to the site-generated traffic. The traffic forecasts were prepared by adding the projected annual background traffic growth and the projected non-development background traffic growth to the existing 2017 traffic counts to determine the "No-Build" traffic conditions. The anticipated Gateway Area development area traffic was then added to the no-build to determine the "Build" traffic conditions. Figures 8-15 in the Appendix shows the projected 2025 and 2040 Build AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes.
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## TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS

Existing and/or forecasted traffic operations were evaluated for the impacted intersections and driveway in the Gateway AUAR development area for each land use scenario. The analysis was conducted for the following conditions.

1. Existing 2017 Conditions
2. Projected 2025 Build
3. Projected 2040 Build

This section describes the methodology used to assess the operations and provides a summary of traffic operations for each scenario.

## A. Methodology

The traffic operations analysis is derived from established methodologies documented in the Highway Capacity Manual 2000 (HCM). The HCM provides a series of analysis techniques that are used to evaluate traffic operations.

Intersections are given a Level of Service (LOS) grade from " $A$ " to " $F$ " to describe the average amount of control delay per vehicle as defined in the HCM. The LOS is primarily a function of peak traffic hour turning movement volumes, intersection lane configuration, and the traffic controls at the intersection. LOS A is the best traffic operating condition, and drivers experience minimal delay at an intersection operating at that level. LOS E represents the condition where the intersection is at capacity, and some drivers may have to wait through more than one green phase to make it through an intersection controlled by traffic signals, LOS F represents a condition where there is more traffic than can be handled by the intersection, and many vehicle operators may have to wait through more than one green phase to make it through the intersection. At a stop sign-controlled intersection, LOS F would be characterized by exceptionally long vehicle queues on each approach at an all-way stop, or long queues and/or great difficulty in finding an acceptable gap for drivers on the minor legs at a through-street intersection.

The LOS ranges for both signalized and un-signalized intersections are shown in Figure 16. The threshold LOS values for un-signalized intersections are slightly less than for signalized intersections. This variance was instituted because drivers' expectations at intersections differ with the type of traffic control. A given LOS can be altered by increasing (or decreasing) the number of lanes, changing traffic control arrangements, adjusting the timing at signalized intersections, or other lesser geometric improvements. LOS also changes as traffic volumes increase or decrease.
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Figure 16 - Level of Service Ranges


LOS, as described above, can also be determined for the individual legs (sometimes referred to as "approaches") or lanes (turn lanes in particular) of an intersection. It should be noted that a LOS E or F might be acceptable or justified in those cases where a leg(s) or lane(s) has a very low traffic volume as compared to the volume on the other legs. For example, improving LOS on such low-volume legs by converting a two-way stop condition to an all-way stop, or adjusting timing at a signalized intersection, could result in a significant penalty for the many drivers on the major road while benefiting the few on the minor road. Also, geometric improvements on minor legs, such as additional lanes or longer turn lanes, could have limited positive effects and might be prohibitive in terms of benefit to cost.

Although LOS A represents the best possible level of traffic flow, the cost to construct roadways and intersection to such a high standard often exceeds the benefit to the user. Funding availability might also lead to acceptance of intersection or roadway designs with a lower LOS. LOS D is generally accepted as the lowest acceptable level in urban areas. LOS C is often considered to be the desirable minimum level for rural areas. LOS D or E may be acceptable for limited durations or distances, or for very low-volume legs of some intersections.

The LOS analysis was performed using Synchro/SimTraffic:

- Synchro, a software package that implements Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) methodologies, was used to build each signalized intersection and provide an input database for turning-movement volumes, lane geometrics, and signal design and timing characteristics. In addition, Synchro was used to optimize signal timing parameters for future conditions. Output from Synchro is transferred to SimTraffic, the traffic simulation model.
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- SimTraffic is a micro-simulation computer modeling software that simulates each individual vehicle's characteristics and driver behavior in response to traffic volumes, intersection configuration, and signal operations. The model simulates drivers' behaviors and responses to surrounding traffic flow as well as different vehicle types and speeds. It outputs estimated vehicle delay and queue lengths at each intersection being analyzed.


## B. Existing Level of Service Summary

The existing intersection operations were evaluated for the AM and PM peak hour based on the current lane geometry, traffic control and traffic volumes. The results of this analysis are illustrated in Table 9. Based on the analysis, the only intersection that is operating at an overall deficient level of service (LOS E or F), is France Avenue at Minnesota Drive which is operating at an overall LOS E during the PM peak hour. All other intersections are operating at an overall LOS D or better. However, there are several movements that are operating at LOS F including:

- France Ave at W. $76^{\text {th }}$ St - Northbound Left - AM Peak $=$ LOS F
- W. 77 th St at SB TH 100 Ramp - Eastbound Through - PM Peak $=$ LOS F
- W. $77^{\text {th }}$ St at NB TH 100 Ramp - Eastbound Left - PM Peak = LOS F
- France Ave at Minnesota Dr - Westbound Left - PM Peak = LOS F

Table 9: Existing (2017) Intersection Level of Service

| Intersection | Existing 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
|  | LOS | Delay | Movement <br> (LOS) | LOS | Delay | Movement <br> (LOS) |
| SB TH 100 / <br> W 77th St | C | 27.1 |  | D | 51.3 | EBT (F) |
| NB TH 100 / <br> W 77th St | C | 24.5 |  | D | 52.6 | EBL (F) |
| Commercial Access / <br> W 77th St | A | 8.2 |  | C | 24.5 |  |
| Computer Ave / <br> W 77th | B | 18.4 |  | C | 25.6 |  |
| Parklawn Ave / <br> W 77th St | C | 20.1 |  | C | 31.3 |  |
| W 77th St / <br> Minnesota Dr | B | 16.3 |  | C | 28.4 |  |
| France Ave / |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| W 76th St |  |  |  |  |  |  | C

[^1]
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## C. Forecasted Traffic Operations

A capacity and LOS analysis was also completed for the study area intersections for each land use scenario for the years 2025 , which is the anticipated year the proposed Gateway Area development would be completed, and; for the 2040 conditions which represents the City's Comprehensive Plan development time frame.

A summary of the expected traffic operations on the key intersections is displayed in Table 10 to 13. Based on the analysis all scenarios will have some operational deficiencies in years 2025 and/or 2040. Deficiencies include operations on France Avenue, the TH 100 interchange, and accesses to the Gateway Study Area. The majority of these locations do not have right or left turn lanes or the existing turn lanes do not have adequate capacity to handle the forecast traffic volumes.

During both the AM peak hour PM peak hours in both 2025 and 2040 assuming with the increase in traffic for each land use scenario, several intersections and movements will be operating at LOS E or F. Specifically, the intersections of $77^{\text {th }}$ Street at the TH 100 ramps, $77^{\text {th }}$ Street at Computer Drive, $77^{\text {th }}$ Street at Parklawn Ave, $77^{\text {th }}$ at Minnesota Drive, France Avenue at $76^{\text {th }}$ Street and France Avenue at Minnesota Street.

Table 10: 2025 AM Peak Hour Intersection Level of Service

| Intersection | 2025 AM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Scenario 1 |  |  | Scenario 2 |  |  | Scenario 3 |  |  | Scenario 4 |  |  |
|  | LOS | Delay | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mvmt } \\ & \text { (LOS) } \end{aligned}$ | LOS | Delay | Mvit (LOS) | LOS | Delay | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mvmt } \\ & \text { (LOS) } \end{aligned}$ | LOS | Delay | Mvmt (LOS) |
| SB TH 100 / W 77th St | D | 50.0 |  | F | $+100$ |  | F | +100 |  | D | 36.2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EBT (F) } \\ & \text { WBL (F) } \end{aligned}$ |
| NB TH 100 / W 77th St | D | 54.5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EBT (F) } \\ & \text { EBR (F) } \end{aligned}$ | E | 77.4 |  | E | 78.9 |  | D | 35.4 | EBT (F) |
| Commercial Access / W 77th St | B | 11.8 |  | B | 14.5 |  | B | 12.3 |  | B | 11.1 |  |
| Computer Ave / W 77th | B | 18.4 |  | C | 23.7 |  | B | 17.2 |  | C | 20.7 |  |
| Parklawn Ave / W 77th St | C | 23.4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WBT (E) } \\ & \text { SBL (E) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | C | 30.0 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WBT (E) } \\ & \text { SBL (E) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | F | +100 |  | C | 22.2 |  |
| W 77th St / Minnesota Dr | B | 13.9 |  | B | 13.9 |  | B | 12.2 |  | B | 16.1 |  |
| France Ave / W 76th St | D | 35.6 | NBL (F) | D | 38.7 | NBL (F) | E | 56.3 | NBL (F) | C | 33.1 | NBL (F) |
| France Ave / Minnesota Dr | C | 33.3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SBL (E) } \\ & \text { EBL (E) } \\ & \text { WBL (E) } \\ & \text { NBL (F) } \end{aligned}$ | D | 35.0 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SBL (E) } \\ & \text { EBL (E) } \\ & \text { WBL (E) } \\ & \text { NBL (F) } \end{aligned}$ | D | 40.6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EBL (E) } \\ & \text { SBL (E) } \\ & \text { WBL (E) } \\ & \text { NBL (F) } \end{aligned}$ | D | 35.0 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SBL (E) } \\ & \text { EBL (E) } \\ & \text { WBL (E) } \\ & \text { NBL (F) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |

Source: WSB \& Associates, Inc.
Note: Based upon criteria shown in Figure 16
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Table 11: 2025 PM Peak Hour Intersection Level of Service

| Intersection | 2025 PM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Scenario 1 |  |  | Scenario 2 |  |  | Scenario 3 |  |  | Scenario 4 |  |  |
|  | LOS | Delay | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mvmt } \\ & \text { (LOS) } \end{aligned}$ | LOS | Delay | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mvert } \\ & \text { (LOS) } \end{aligned}$ | LOS | Delay | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mvmt } \\ & \text { (LOS) } \end{aligned}$ | LOS | Delay | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mvmt } \\ & \text { (LOS) } \end{aligned}$ |
| SB TH 100 / W 77th St | E | 62.3 | EB (F) | E | 59.8 | EBT (F) | F | +100 |  | E | 72.0 | EBT (F) |
| NB TH 100 / <br> W 77th St | E | 68.7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EBL (F) } \\ & \text { EBT (F) } \\ & \text { NBL (F) } \end{aligned}$ | F | +100 |  | F | +100 |  | E | 66.1 | EB (F) |
| Commercial Access / W 77th St | D | 39.5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EBL (F) } \\ & \text { NBT (F) } \end{aligned}$ | C | 31.4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EBL (E) } \\ & \text { NBT (E) } \\ & \text { WBT (E) } \end{aligned}$ | D | 47.4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NBL (F) } \\ & \text { SBL (F) } \\ & \text { EBL (F) } \end{aligned}$ | C | 31.5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NBL (F) } \\ & \text { EBL (F) } \end{aligned}$ |
| Computer Ave / W 77th | F | +100 |  | F | +100 |  | F | +100 |  | E | 62.5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WBT (F) } \\ & \text { NBL (F) } \end{aligned}$ |
| Parklawn Ave / W 77th St | F | +100 |  | F | +100 |  | F | +100 |  | C | 27.5 |  |
| W 77th St / Minnesota Dr | E | 61.4 | SBL (F) | E | 66.1 | SBL (F) | E | 71.7 | SBL (F) | C | 24.0 |  |
| France Ave / W 76th St | F | +100 |  | F | +100 |  | F | +100 |  | F | +100 |  |
| France Ave / Minnesota Dr | F | +100 |  | F | +100 |  | F | +100 |  | F | +100 |  |

Source: WSB \& Associates, Inc.
Note: Based upon criteria shown in Figure 16
Table 12: 2040 AM Peak Hour Intersection Level of Service

| Intersection | 2040 AM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Scenario 1 |  |  | Scenario 2 |  |  | Scenario 3 |  |  | Scenario 4 |  |  |
|  | LOS | Delay | Mvmt (LOS) | LOS | Delay | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mvmt } \\ & \text { (LOS) } \end{aligned}$ | LOS | Delay | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mvmt } \\ & \text { (LOS) } \end{aligned}$ | LOS | Delay | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mvmt } \\ & \text { (LOS) } \end{aligned}$ |
| SB TH 100 / W 77th St | D | 51.2 |  | F | +100 |  | F | +100 |  | C | 38.0 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EBT (F) } \\ & \text { WBL (F) } \end{aligned}$ |
| NB TH 100 / W 77th St | E | 55.7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EBT (F) } \\ & \text { EBR (F) } \end{aligned}$ | F | 82.2 |  | F | 84.0 |  | D | 41.2 | EBT (F) |
| Commercial Access / W 77th St | B | 12.9 |  | B | 16.1 |  | B | 12.8 |  | B | 11.6 |  |
| Computer Ave / W 77th | B | 19.6 |  | C | 24.1 |  | B | 18.0 |  | C | 22.6 |  |
| Parklawn Ave / W 77th St | C | 24.4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WBT (E) } \\ & \text { SBL (E) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | C | 30.5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WBT (E) } \\ & \text { SBL (E) } \end{aligned}$ | F | +100 |  | C | 23.8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SBL (F) } \\ & \text { WBT (F) } \end{aligned}$ |
| W 77th St / Minnesota Dr | B | 15.7 |  | B | 14.8 |  | B | 12.8 |  | B | 17.3 |  |
| France Ave / W 76th St | D | 36.4 | NBL (F) | D | 40.7 | NBL (F) | E | 68.3 | NBL (F) | C | 35.6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SBL (E) } \\ & \text { EBL (E) } \\ & \text { WBL (E) } \\ & \text { NBL (F) } \end{aligned}$ |
| France Ave / Minnesota Dr | C | 38.5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SBL (E) } \\ & \text { EBL (E) } \\ & \text { WBL (E) } \\ & \text { NBL (F) } \end{aligned}$ | D | 46.8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SBL (E) } \\ & \text { SBT (E) } \\ & \text { NBL (F) } \\ & \text { WBL (F) } \\ & \text { SBL (F) } \end{aligned}$ | D | 41.2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SBL (E) } \\ & \text { SBT (E) } \\ & \text { NBL (F) } \\ & \text { WBL (F) } \\ & \text { SBL (F) } \end{aligned}$ | C | 37.0 | SBL (E) <br> EBL (E) <br> WBL (E) <br> NBL (F) |

Source: WSB \& Associates, Inc.
Note: Based upon criteria shown in Figure 16
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Table 13: 2040 PM Peak Hour Intersection Level of Service

| Intersection | 2040 PM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Scenario 1 |  |  | Scenario 2 |  |  | Scenario 3 |  |  | Scenario 4 |  |  |
|  | LOS | Dela $y$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mvmt } \\ & \text { (LOS) } \end{aligned}$ | LOS | Dela <br> y | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mvmt } \\ & \text { (LOS) } \end{aligned}$ | LOS | $\begin{gathered} \text { Dela } \\ y \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Mvmt (LOS) | LOS | $\begin{gathered} \text { Dela } \\ y \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mvmt } \\ & \text { (LOS) } \end{aligned}$ |
| SB TH 100 / W77th St | F | 83.8 |  | E | 62.1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EBT (F) } \\ & \text { EBR (F) } \end{aligned}$ | F | +100 |  | E | 75.1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EBT (F) } \\ & \text { EBR (F) } \end{aligned}$ |
| NB TH 100 / W 77th St | E | 77.6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NB (F) } \\ & \text { EB (F) } \end{aligned}$ | F | +100 |  | F | +100 |  | E | 68.3 | EB (F) |
| Commercial Access / W 77th St | D | 41.2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NB (F) } \\ & \text { SB (F) } \end{aligned}$ | C | 32.9 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EBL (E) } \\ & \text { NBL (E) } \\ & \text { WBT (E) } \end{aligned}$ | D | 48.2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NBL (F) } \\ & \text { SBL (F) } \\ & \text { EBL (F) } \end{aligned}$ | C | 33.4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NB (F) } \\ & \text { EBL }(F) \end{aligned}$ |
| Computer Ave / W 77th | F | +100 |  | F | +100 |  | F | +100 |  | E | 63.8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WBT (F) } \\ & \text { WBR (F) } \\ & \text { NBL (F) } \end{aligned}$ |
| Parklawn Ave / W 77th St | F | +100 |  | F | +100 |  | F | +100 |  | C | 28.2 | SBT (F) |
| W 77th St / Minnesota Dr | F | $+100$ |  | E | 66.5 | SB (F) | E | 73.4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SBT (F) } \\ & \text { SBL (F) } \end{aligned}$ | C | 26.1 |  |
| France Ave / W 76th St | F | +100 |  | F | $+100$ |  | F | +100 |  | F | +100 |  |
| France Ave / Minnesota Dr | F | +100 |  | F | +100 |  | F | +100 |  | F | +100 |  |

Source: WSB \& Associates, Inc.
Note: Based upon criteria shown in Figure 16

## D. Mitigated Traffic Operations

Mitigation improvements that would improve all intersections and movement to an acceptable LOS E or better includes:

## 2025 Mitigation:

1. Addition of a northbound dual right-turn lane at $77^{\text {th }}$ Street and TH 100 SB Ramp.
2. Addition of a westbound right-turn lane at $77^{\text {th }}$ Street and TH 100 NB Ramp.
3. Addition of a northbound left turn lane, eastbound right turn lane and signal timing improvements at $77^{\text {th }}$ Street and Commercial Access driveway.
4. Improved signal timing at $77^{\text {th }}$ Street and Computer Avenue.
5. Addition of a northbound dual left turn lane, southbound left turn lane and eastbound right turn lane at $7^{\text {th }}$ Street and Computer Drive.
6. Addition of a northbound through lane at France Avenue and Minnesota Street.
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## 2040 Mitigation:

1. 2025 Improvements
2. Addition of a northbound through lane at France Avenue and Minnesota Drive.
3. Addition of a southbound through lane at France Avenue and $76^{\text {th }}$ Street.
4. Addition of an eastbound and westbound third lane on $77^{\text {th }}$ Street from TH 100 SB Ramp through Computer Drive.
5. Addition of an eastbound and westbound dual left turn lane at France Avenue and Minnesota Street.
6. Addition of a southbound left turn lane at $77^{\text {th }}$ Street and Minnesota Street.
7. Addition of an eastbound right turn lane at $77^{\text {th }}$ Street and Parklawn Avenue.

Based on the proposed mitigation improvements a capacity and level of service analysis was completed using the projected 2040 traffic volumes for each scenario. The results are shown in Tables 14 and 15. The results show that all intersections would be operating at overall LOS D or better for all scenarios in both the AM and PM peak hours.

Table 14: 2040 AM Peak Hour Mitigation Intersection Level of Service

| Intersection | 2040 AM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Scenario 1 |  | Scenario 2 |  | Scenario 3 |  | Scenario 4 |  |  |
|  | LOS | Delay | LOS | Delay | LOS | Delay | LOS | Delay |  |
| SB TH 100 / <br> W 77th St | D | 44.9 | D | 54.0 | D | 53.3 | D | 46.8 |  |
| NB TH 100 / <br> W 77th St | C | 25.9 | C | 28.2 | D | 35.3 | C | 25.4 |  |
| Commercial <br> Access / <br> W 77th St | A | 8.0 | B | 15.6 | B | 12.4 | A | 8.1 |  |
| Computer Ave / <br> W 77th | A | 6.0 | B | 11.5 | A | 7.2 | A | 6.6 |  |
| Parklawn Ave / <br> W 77th St | C | 29.0 | C | 22.2 | B | 16.9 | C | 26.8 |  |
| W 77th St / <br> Minnesota Dr | B | 19.1 | B | 16.1 | B | 16.4 | C | 20.6 |  |
| France Ave / <br> W 76th St | C | 26.7 | C | 27.2 | C | 34.8 | C | 26.2 |  |
| France Ave / <br> Minnesota Dr | C | 23.2 | C | 25.2 | D | 37.4 | C | 22.4 |  |
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Table 15: 2040 PM Peak Hour Mitigation Intersection Level of Service

| Intersection | 2040 PM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Scenario 1 |  | Scenario 2 |  | Scenario 3 |  | Scenario 4 |  |  |
|  | LOS | Delay | LOS | Delay | LOS | Delay | LOS | Delay |  |
| SB TH 100 / <br> W 77th St | D | 47.7 | D | 45.9 | C | 33.2 | D | 53.2 |  |
| NB TH 100 / <br> W 77th St | C | 33.4 | D | 40.7 | C | 30.1 | C | 26.3 |  |
| Commercial <br> Access / <br> W 77th St | B | 10.8 | B | 19.6 | C | 27.8 | B | 14.4 |  |
| Computer Ave / <br> W 77th | C | 22.4 | C | 24.7 | D | 46.5 | C | 26.2 |  |
| Parklawn Ave / <br> W 77th St | D | 37.0 | C | 32.4 | D | 47.0 | D | 40.7 |  |
| W 77th St / <br> Minnesota Dr | C | 30.3 | C | 23.9 | E | 57.4 | D | 38.9 |  |
| France Ave / <br> W 76th St | D | 35.8 | C | 32.7 | D | 45.0 | C | 27.1 |  |
| France Ave / <br> Minnesota Dr | D | 50.5 | D | 40.8 | C | 28.8 | D | 50.8 |  |

## TRANSIT

Currently there are two forms of transit service within the City of Edina.
Paratransit: Paratransit services are currently provided by Edina Dial-A-Raid Transportation. Door-to-door services provided using a wheelchair lift equipped van on a first-come, first-service basis. Hours of operation are Monday through Friday, 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m., 24-hour advance notice for scheduling is required. Anyone living in Edina is eligible.

Scheduled Transit: The key transit facility in Edina is a Southdale transit center. This is part of the Southdale shopping mall. It includes a covered shelter area with routes and schedule information. The Southdale transit center is one of the busier transit centers in the Twin Cities, with eight transit lines which stop and link at this location. There are also 100 parking spaces at a metro transit Park'n Ride lot at this location.

The existing scheduled services to Edina residents is depicted in Table 16.

## Draft

Table 16 - Existing Scheduled Transit Service in Edina

| Route | Service Route/Area | Service Description |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |$|$| 6 | Edina (includes Southdale Transit Center), Uptown, <br> downtown Minneapolis, University of Minnesota | High frequency local service, all day/evening, <br> all week; 5-15 minute headways |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 46 | Edina (includes 50th/France), south Minneapolis, St <br> Paul | Local service all day/evening, all week: 30-60 <br> minute headways |
| 114 | Edina (includes Southdale Transit Center), south <br> Minneapolis, Uptown University of Minnesota | Commuter/student service during a.m. and p.m. <br> rush hours, weekdays |
| 146 | Edina (Vernon Ave.), southwest Minneapolis, <br> downtown Minneapolis | Commuter express (I-35W) service during a.m. <br> and p.m. rush hours, weekdays |
| 152 | Edina (includes Southdale Transit Center), Lake <br> Street, University of Minnesota | Commuter/student express (I-35W) service <br> during a.m. and p.m. rush hours, weekdays |
| 515 | Edina (Includes Southdale Transit Center), Richfield, <br> South Minneapolis, Bloomington (includes Mall of <br> America), Veterans Medical Center (alternate route) | Local service, all day/evening, all week; 10-30 <br> minute headways |
| 538 | Edina (includes Southdale Transit Center), <br> Bloomington (includes Mall of America) | Local service, all day/evening, all week; 30-60 <br> minute headways |
| 539 | Edina (includes Southdale Transit Center), <br> Bloomington (includes Normandale Community <br> College, Mall of America) | Local service, all day/evening, all week; 30-60 <br> minute headways |
| 540 | Edina, Richfield (includes Best Buy Headquarters), <br> Bloomington (includes Mall of America) | Local service, all day/evening, all week; 15-30 <br> minute headways during a.m./p.m. rush hours, <br> otherwise 30-60 minute headways |
| 568 | Downtown Minneapolis, south Minneapolis, Edina, <br> Minnetonka (Opportunity Partners) | Weekdays only, one a.m. run from Minneapolis <br> to Opportunity Partners; one p.m. run from <br> Opportunity Partners to Minneapolis |
| 578 | Edina (includes Southdale Transit Center), downtown <br> Minneapolis | Commuter express service (TH 62 and I-35W) <br> during a.m. and p.m. rush hours |
| 587 | Edina, downtown Minneapolis | Commuter express service (TH 100 and I-394) <br> during a.m. and p.m. rush hours, weekdays |
| 631 | Chanhassen, Eden Prairie, Edina (Southdale Transit <br> Center) | Weekday service, morning through evening; <br> approximately 10 runs per day each direction |
| (Southwest) |  |  |

Note: all routes are Metro Transit with the exception of 631, which is Southwest Metro Transit.

## NON-MOTORIZED TRANSPORTATION

Sidewalks and other pedestrian facilities are important components of Edina's transportation infrastructure. Sidewalks and paths provide safe movement for individuals of all ages, decrease dependence on motor vehicles, and encourage active lifestyles. An important key to an effective municipal sidewalk system is in providing networking continuity such that there is broad geographic coverage for a range of users without notable gaps. The Gateway Study Area is a critical link in Edina's non-motorized transportation system.

The City of Edina's 2008 Comprehensive Plan includes a variety of Travel Demand Management (TDM) and non-motorized vehicle transportation (transit, pedestrian/bike facilities) policies and guidelines for development of these facilities or expanded facilities. However, as development continues to grow, specifically in the Gateway Study Area, consideration of site-specific improvements as developments are proposed needs to be included. These would include upgrading the existing bus shelters to become ADA compliant and improvements of sidewalk and/or path connections.

## Draft

## AUAR MITIGATION REQIREMENTS

Many of the mitigation measures outlined in the 2007 AUAR still remain valid. The updated mitigation measures are outlined below and either remain in effect from the 2007 AUAR or have been updated based on new analysis as noted. Each mitigation includes if the improvement is needed with the no-build or build (with Gateway Area development) conditions and what year (2025 or 2040) the improvement is required.

Based upon the analysis, deficiencies exist for all scenarios near the TH 100/West $77^{\text {th }}$ Street Interchange, on $77^{\text {th }}$ Street and on France Avenue. Intersection signal timing was first modified to provide optimal operations in each scenario. Mitigation strategies were developed for each scenario are listed below.

## Scenarios 1 and 4:

The following mitigation strategies are needed for Scenario 1 and 4 to accommodate both 2025 and 2040 traffic projections:

| Intersection: | France Avenue at West $76^{\text {th }}$ Street <br> Extend one southbound thru lane on France Avenue to create a <br> total of four thru lanes <br> 2040 No-Build |
| :--- | :--- |
| Improvement: |  |$\quad$| Needed By: | Northbound TH 100 at West 77 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Intersection: Street |  |
| Add 150 foot northbound right turn lane on Frontage Road |  |
| Westbound dual right turn lanes on West 77 |  |

## Scenario 2:

Scenario 2 will require all the improvements listed above in addition to the following:

Intersection: Minnesotá Drive at France Avenue
Improvement: Dual westbound left turn lanes on Minnesota Drive Eastbound dual left turn lanes on Minnesota Drive
Need By: $\quad 2040$ Full Build

## Draft

| Intersection: | Northbound TH 100 at West 77th Street |
| :---: | :---: |
| Improvement: | Add 150 foot eastbound right turn lane on West 77 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street |
| Need By: | 2025 Build |
| Intersection: | Computer Avenue at West $77^{\text {th }}$ Street |
| Improvement: | Northbound dual left turn lanes on Computer Avenue |
| Need By: | 2040 Full Build |
| Intersection: | Minnesota Drive / Johnson Avenue at West $77^{\text {th }}$ Street Avenue |
| Improvement: | Southbound dual left turn lanes on West $77{ }^{\text {th }}$ Street |
| Need By: | 2040 Full Build |

## Scenario 3:

Scenario 3 will require all the above improvements listed under Scenarios 1, 2, and 4 in addition to the following:

| Intersection: | Minnesota Drive at France Avenue |
| :--- | :--- |
| Improvement: | Eastbound dual right turn lanes on Minnesota Drive <br> 2040 Full Build |
| Need By: | France Avenue at West $78^{\text {th }}$ Street |
| Intersection: | Westbound dual right turn lanes on West 78 th Street |
| Improvement: | 2040 Full Build |

## Transit/Non-Motorized Transportation

As redevelopment occurs in the Gateway Study Area, consideration of site-specific improvements needs to be included as developments are proposed. These would include upgrading the existing transit facilities, including bus shelters, to become ADA compliant and improving the sidewalk and/or path connections in and around each redevelopment.

## General

The mitigation measures discussion above are needed to address full build-out of the site and surrounding area. Specific mitigation measures required for proposed development plans will be established through traffic and transportation studies required for each development proposal. These proposals will need to document compliance with the Final AUAR and Mitigation Plan.

## Draft

## APPENDIX
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| Figure 13B - Scenario 2 (2040) Traffic |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Gateway Study Area | attr lane ceoue |
| AUAR Update Traffic Study |  |






ORDINANCE NO. 2022-
AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE ZONING ORDINANCE TO REVISE THE PUD-I7, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT-I7 ZONING DISTRICT

The City Of Edina Ordains:
Section I. Chapter 36, Article VIII, Division 4 is hereby amended as follows:
Sec. 36-507 Planned Unit Development District-I7 (PUD-I7) Pentagon Park South
(a) Legal description:

See attached Exhibit A
(b) Approved Plans. Incorporated herein by reference are the re-development plans, including the master development plan for the site received by the City on January 17, 2019, except as amended by City Council Resolution No. 2019-17 on file in the Office of the Planning Department.
(c) Revised Plans. Incorporated herein by reference are the revised plans for 491I $77^{\text {th }}$ Street West as approved by City Council Resolution No. 2021-61 on file in the office of the Planning Department.
(d) Principal Uses:

All uses allowed in the MDD-6 Zoning District Multi-family Apartments/Condos.
(e) Accessory Uses:

All accessory uses allowed in the MDD-3-6 Zoning District.
(f) Conditional Uses:

All conditional uses allowed in the MDD-3-6 Zoning District.
(g) Development Standards.

|  | Required |
| :---: | :---: |
| Setbacks - Buildings <br> $77^{\text {th }}$ Street <br> Computer Avenue <br> Normandale Boulevard Viking Drive | 15 feet 15 feet 50 feet 10 Feet |
| Building Height | 12 stories \& 144 feet per the height overlay district |
| Parking lot and drive aisle setback | 20 feet |
| Building Coverage | 30\% |
| Maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) | I.5\% |
| Parking Stalls - Mixed Development District Phase I (Based on the uses) | 602 stalls <br> +152 enclosed stalls for the residential use on Lot 3, Block I |

(h) Signs shall be regulated per the Mixed Development District. Signs for the First Bank and Trust located on Lot 4, shall be allowed per their approved Site Plan, including the non-street front wall signage facing the interior of the development.
(i) Ninety percent (90\%) of the parking stalls within the development shall be available to all uses within the development.
(j) Ten percent (10\%) of the units must be provided for affordable housing for families or individuals earning 60\% area median income (AMI) for the Twin Cities.

First Reading:

## Second Reading:

Published:

Attest:
Sharon Allison, City Clerk
James B. Hovland, Mayor

Please publish in the Edina Sun Current on:
Send two affidavits of publication.
Bill to Edina City Clerk
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## Survey Responses

## Public Hearing Comments-First Bank and Trust

## Better Together Edina

Project: Public Hearing: First Bank and Trust- 4901 77th St W.

| VIIITORS <br> 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { CONTRIBUTORS } \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | RESPONSES 2 |  |  |
| $\underset{\text { Registered }}{0}$ | $0$ | $\underset{\text { Anonymous }}{2}$ | $\underset{\text { Registered }}{0}$ | $0$ | $\underset{\text { Anonymous }}{2}$ |

Responded At: Oct 06, 2022 06:13:47 am Last Seen: Oct 06, 2022 06:13:47 am
IP Address: n/a


#### Abstract

Q1. First and Last Name Avery Ticer

Q2. Address

Cushman \& Wakefield, Executive Director of Capital Markets Group

\section*{Q3. Comment}

I am writing to express my support for the pending Site Plan Application for Lot \#4 at Pentagon Park for First Bank \& Trust to expand its growing operation. As a resident of Edina for the past 20 years and father of three (3) young children, I am fully in support of this expansion and am confident it will be a tremendous value-add to Pentagon Park and the City of Edina. I drive by the proposed location multiple times per day and firmly believe that the proposed development will greatly enhance the overall area and fits with the vision at that location. The renderings fit nicely with the area, and it looks like First Bank \& Trust have gone above and beyond to make the final project aesthetically attractive at greater expense to them. Their growth and desire to expand their footprint at this location demonstrates the vibrancy in our community and successful firms who operate in the city. I hope the City of Edina appreciates the lengths First Bank \& Trust is undertaking to make the building align with the greater plan for Pentagon Park and how taxpayers in Edina want to see more projects like this get support and approved. We should all be in favor of this expansion particularly given the uncertainty in the current economic environment. I hope the City of Edina will be supportive of the economic growth that this project represents.


Responded At: Oct 19, 2022 09:40:53 am Last Seen: Oct 19, 2022 09:40:53 am
IP Address: n/a

Q1. First and Last Name

Q2. Address

Erik Kvalseth

7465 W Shore Dr

Q3. Comment
I am opposed to the internally facing sign. They're already on a corner. Seems like two signs is plenty. They should be able to either point one of the two approved signs into the development or use the bank's windows. It's not like the internally facing sign needs to be seen from far away.

October 13, 2022

## Statement of Support <br> First Bank \& Trust Relocation to Pentagon Village Lot \#4 <br> Edina Chamber of Commerce

To Whom It May Concern:
On behalf of the Edina Chamber of Commerce, and Explore Edina, we wish to express our full support of the First Bank \& Trust Relocation to Pentagon Village Lot \#4 by Hillcrest Development and HTG Architects. We understand the bank has a need to expand its space for growing operations and believe it will be a valuable addition to the overall Pentagon Village development.

Great care has been taken from a design perspective on integrating the bank architecturally with the existing buildings at Pentagon Village, including the apartment development on Lot \#3 currently under construction, and the soon to be started dual flag hotel for Lot \#2.

We support this project for the following reasons:

- Two stories in height is consistent with the previously approved plan for Lot \#4 at Pentagon Village.
- It appears the architects have done a fine job of incorporating design elements quality building materials while balancing the needs for security and safety for a full-service banking operation.
- An internal drive through and parking concept has been incorporated, allowing the architecture to be the focus.

Thank you very much for your time and consideration. We appreciate your support of our growing business community in Edina.


Shelly Loberg
Vice President

Zoning Ordinance Amendment \& Site Plan Review - Pentagon Village, First Bank and Trust
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## This Request Requires:

1. Site Plan review; and
2. Ordinance amendment to allow interior facing signage.

## Review of the Site Plan

The CITY of EDINA
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##  EDINA

|  | PUD-17 | Proposed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Setbacks - Buildings <br> 77th Street <br> Computer Avenue <br> Normandale Boulevard Viking Drive | 15 feet <br> 15 feet <br> 50 feet <br> 10 Feet | 16 feet <br> 15 feet <br> NA <br> NA |
| Building Height | 12 stories \& 144 feet per the height overlay district | 2 stories |
| Parking lot and drive aisle setback | 20 feet | 20+ feet |
| Maximum Floor Area <br> Ratio (FAR) | 1.5\% | 1.5\% |
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## Better Together Edina

Recommendation

The CITY of EDINA






FFirst Bank \&Trust

$\mathcal{F}$ First Bank \& Trust


FFirst Bank \& Trust
旦F


First Bank \&Trust

$\mathcal{F}$ First Bank \&Trust



First Bank \& Trust
HFG


First Bank \&Trust
旦G


FFirst Bank \& Trust
旦G

$\bar{\mp}$ First Bank \& Trust
旦


## CITY OF EDINA

4801 West 50th Street<br>Edina, MN 55424

www.edinamn.gov

Date: October 25, 2022
Agenda Item \#: VI.B.

Item Type:
Report and Recommendation
From: Cary Teague, Community Development Director
Subject: Subdivision with Lot Area, Width and Depth
Variances - 6416 McCauley Circle

Item Activity:
Action

## ACTION REQUESTED:

Recommend the City Council approve the Subdivision with Variances

## INTRODUCTION:

Dipendra Mahaseth has requested a subdivision with multiple variances to tear down the existing home at 6416 McCauley Circle and build two new homes. One home would gain access off McCauley Circle and the other off McCauley Terrace.

Within this neighborhood, the minimum lot size is established by the median width, depth and area of all lots within 500 feet of the property. (See attached calculation done by Harry S. Johnson Surveyors) Therefore the minimum required lot area is 18,731 s.f., lot width 102 feet and lot depth 181 feet.

To accommodate the request the following is required:

1. A Subdivision; and
2. Lot Area, Width and Depth Variances for Lot 1; and Lot Depth Variance for Lot 2.

## ATTACHMENTS:

## Staff Report

Proposed Subdivision Plans
500-Foot Median Calculation
Tree Plan
Applicant narrative and signed supporters of the project
Site Location and Zoning Map
Recent Subdivisions

Lot Sizes on McCauley Terrace and McCauley Circle
Better Together Public Hearing Comment Report
Site Photos - McCauley Circle and Terrace
Staff Presentation

Date: October 25, 2022

To: Planning Commission

From: Cary Teague, Community Development Director

Subject: Subdivision with Lot Area, Width and Depth Variances - 6416 McCauley Circle

## Information / Background:

Dipendra Mahaseth has requested a subdivision with multiple variances to tear down the existing home at 6416 McCauley Circle and build two new homes. One home would gain access off McCauley Circle and the other off McCauley Terrace.

Within this neighborhood, the minimum lot size is established by the median width, depth and area of all lots within 500 feet of the property. (See attached calculation done by Harry S. Johnson Surveyors) Therefore the minimum required lot area is $18,73 \mathrm{I}$ s.f., lot width 102 feet, and lot depth 181 feet.

To accommodate the request the following is required:
I. A Subdivision; and
2. Lot Area, Width and Depth Variances for Lot I; and Lot Depth and Street Frontage Variance for Lot 2.

## Surrounding Land Uses

The lots to the north contain duplexes and are zoned R-2; the lots to the south contain singlefamily residential homes and are Zoned R-I. (See attached Zoning Map.)

## Existing Site Features

The existing site contains a single-family home that would be removed. The site is wooded and contains slopes that fall toward Arrowhead Lake.

## Planning

Guide Plan designation: Single-dwelling residential
Zoning:

## Lot Dimensions

|  | Area | Lot Width | Depth |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| REQUIRED | 18,73 I s.f. | 102 feet | I8I feet |
| Lot I | $\mathbf{I 6 , 4 3 I}$ s.f.* | $\mathbf{8 0}$ feet* | $\mathbf{I 2 0}$ feet* |
| Lot 2 | 19,047 s.f. | 190 feet | $\mathbf{I 0 0}$ feet* |

*Variance Required
City Code requires a minimum of 30 feet of width at the street, the proposed Lot 2 has 28.58 feet of width.

## City Considerations

Sec. 32-I30. - Considerations. The planning commission, in reviewing proposed plats and subdivisions and in determining its recommendation to the council, and the council in determining whether to approve or disapprove of any plat or subdivision, may consider, among other matters, the following:
(I) Whether the physical characteristics of the property, including, without limitation, topography, vegetation, susceptibility to erosion or siltation, susceptibility to flooding, use as a natural recovery and ponding area for storm water, and potential disturbance of slopes with a grade of 18 percent or more, are such that the property is not suitable for the type of development or use proposed.
(2) Whether development within the proposed plat or subdivision will cause the disturbance of more than 25 percent of the total area in such plat or subdivision containing slopes exceeding 18 percent.
(3) Comply with section 10-82. (Tree Ordinance)

Protected trees may be removed without mitigation, in the following areas:
a. Including, and within a ten-foot radius of, the building pad, deck or patio of a new or remodeled building.
b. Including, and within a five-foot radius of driveways and parking areas.
c. Including, and within ten-foot radius of installation of public infrastructure improvements including public roadways, stormwater retention areas and utilities.

Trees outside of these areas would have to be replaced.
Sec. 32-I3I. - Additional considerations
In addition to the foregoing matters, the commission, in connection with its recommendation to the council, and the council in determining whether to approve or disapprove a proposed plat or subdivision, shall specifically and especially consider the following matters:
(I) Whether the proposed plat or subdivision complies with the policies, objectives and goals of the comprehensive plan.
(2) Whether the proposed plat or subdivision complies with chapter 36 .
(3) Whether the design of the proposed plat or subdivision, or the design or type of improvements proposed to be placed thereon, may be detrimental to the health, safety or general welfare of the public.
(4) Whether the proposed plat or subdivision conforms to, and complies with, the requirements of applicable state law.
(5) Whether the proposed plat or subdivision complies with the policies, objectives, goals and requirements of this chapter, as varied by variances therefrom, if any.

The applicant has presented a plat that would not disturb the $18 \%$ slope areas by more than $25 \%$ on each lot. (See attached.) However, the request does require several variances.

Sec. 36-1257. - Drainage, retaining walls and site access.
(a) Drainage. No person shall obstruct or divert the natural flow of runoff so as to harm the public health, safety or general welfare. Surface water runoff shall be properly conveyed into storm sewers, watercourses, ponding areas or other public facilities. As part of the building permit, the applicant must submit a grading and erosion control plan along with a stormwater management plan that is signed by a licensed professional engineer. The stormwater management plan must detail how stormwater will be controlled to prevent damage to adjacent property and adverse impacts to the public stormwater drainage system. The plans must be approved by the city engineer and the permit holder must adhere to the approved plans.

As mentioned, the site drains toward Arrowhead Lake. The applicant is proposing to capture runoff in the rear yard of each site in a rain garden to slow it down before flowing to the east toward the lake. (See attached grading and drainage plan). The city engineer has reviewed the proposed plans and found them to be acceptable. There shall be no increase in peak rate or volume to neighboring private properties. The detailed grading plans would be reviewed by the city engineer at the time of building permit application for each lot. Each lot would be custom graded at the time of building permit. A construction management plan will be required for the construction of the new homes. (See the attached grading plan.)

## Tree Removal

With the layout of the subdivision there would be 23 trees removed to accommodate the building pads, driveway and stormwater retention areas. The city recently amended its tree ordinance to require that these trees will need to be replace. The ordinance does not take effect until January I, 2023. However, because there are variances being request, and to minimize impacts to the neighborhood, staff would recommend that if the proposal is approved one of the conditions of approval be that the new ordinance must be met, with trees being replaced on the site.

## Park Dedication

As with all subdivision proposals, park dedication is required. Edina City Code requires a park dedication fee of $\$ 5,000$ for each additional lot created. Therefore, a park dedication fee of $\$ 5,000$ would be required for the one additional lot.

## History of Subdivision Requests with Variances

The City of Edina has considered several subdivision requests with variances in this general area. (See attached area map.) The following is the history in the past 15 years:

History of Recent Subdivisions with Variances
I. In 2006, the property at 5901 France Avenue received variances to build four (4) 66-foot wide lots consistent with the area. (Median = 9,269 s.f. \& 73 feet wide.)
2. In 2008, 6120 Brookview Avenue was proposed to be divided into two (2) 50 -foot lots; however, the applicant withdrew the request before action was taken. (Median = 6,700 s.f. \& 50 feet wide.)
3. In 2009, a 100-foot lot at 5920 Oaklawn was granted variances to divide into two (2) 50foot lots. (Median = 6,699 s.f. \& 50 feet wide.)
4. In 201I, the property at 5829 Brookview was granted variances to divide into two (2) 50foot lots. (Median = 6,769 s.f. \& 50 feet wide.)
5. In 2012, the property at 6109 Oaklawn was denied the request to subdivide the property into two (2) 50 -foot lots. (Median $=\mathbf{6 , 7 0 I}$ s.f. \& 50 feet wide.)
6. In 2012, 6I20 Brookview was again proposed for subdivision. That request was denied. (Median = 6,700 s.f. \& 50 feet wide.)
7. In 2012,5945 Concord was denied the request to subdivide the property into two (2)50foot lots. (Median = I0,028 s.f. \& 77 feet wide.)
8. In 2015, a 100 -foot lot at 5825 Ashcroft Avenue was granted variances to divide into two (2) 50 -foot lots. (Median $=\mathbf{6 , 7 9 0}$ s.f. \& 50 feet wide.)

9 In 2015, 5945 Concord was approved for a request to subdivide the property into two (2) 50 -foot lots. (Median = I0,028 s.f. \& 77 feet wide.)
10. In 2016, 5845 Kellogg Avenue was denied a request to subdivide the property into two (2) 50 -foot lots. (Median = 6,7I5 s.f. \& 50 feet wide.)
II. In 20I7, 6I24 Ewing Avenue was approved for a request to subdivide into two (2) lots with lot width and area variances. (Median = I I,500 s.f. \& 80 feet wide.)
12. In 2017, 5404 Park Place was approved for a request to subdivide into two (2) lots with lot width variances from 75 feet to 65 feet for each lot; and lot area variances from 9,000 square feet to 8,705 and 8,840 square feet. (Median $=8,107$ s.f. \& width was 60 feet wide.)
13. In 2019, 584I Oaklawn was approved for a request to subdivide into two (2) lots with lot width variances from 75 feet to 50 feet for one lot; and lot area variances from 9,000 square feet to 8,793 and 6,694 square feet.
14. In 2019, 4625 Lexington was approved for a request to subdivide into two (2) lots with lot width variances from 75 feet to 60 feet for both lots, and lot area variances from 9,306 square feet to 8,106 and 8,128 square feet. (Median area - 9,306 square feet, median lot depth - 135 feet, and the median lot width 68 feet)
15. In 2020, 5928 Ashcroft was denied a request to subdivide into two (2) lots with lot width variances from 75 feet to 50 feet for both lots, and lot area variances from 9,000 square feet to 6,813 and 6,790 square feet. (Median area - 8,84I s.f., median lot depth - I35 and median width was 66 feet.)
16. In 2020, 5928 Abbott Avenue was approved for a two-lot subdivision with lot width variances from 75 feet to 50 feet for both lots, lot area variance from 9,000 square feet to $6,39 \mathrm{I}$ and $6,33 \mathrm{I}$ square feet, and lot depth variances from 135 feet to 127 feet for both lots. (Median lot area-6,745 square feet, median lot depth - 129.9 feet, and the median lot width - 50 feet.)

The City has approved and denied similar subdivisions. However, in the instances when subdivisions have been denied, the area immediately surrounding the site contained a wide variety of lot sizes. In instances when subdivisions have been approved, the requesting lots have been similar to lots in the immediate area. The proposed new lots are similar in size to other lots in this neighborhood. (See attached location maps and lot size maps of lots on McCauley Circle and Terrace.)

## Primary Issues

- Is the proposed subdivision reasonable for the site?

Yes. Staff believes that the proposed subdivision is reasonable for the following reasons:

1. Lots within this area have a wide variety of shapes and sizes. (See attached neighborhood Map \& Maps showing lot sizes on McCauley Terrace and McCauley Circle.)
2. The proposed lots are generally similar in size and shape to other lots within this area, including width at the street.
3. The existing lot is the largest in the area.
4. The lots on McCauley Terrace are all irregular in shape. There appears to be a vacant lot on McCauley Terrace, as the existing lot gains vehicular access off McCauley Circle. (See attached pictures.)
5. Upon compliance with all city and watershed district requirements for grading and drainage, the proposed subdivision would not have a negative impact on adjacent property.

- Are the findings for a variance met?

Yes. Staff believes that the findings for a Variance are met for this subdivision.
Per state law and the Zoning Ordinance, a variance should not be granted unless it is found that the enforcement of the ordinance would cause practical difficulties in complying with the zoning ordinance and that the use is reasonable. As demonstrated below, staff believes the proposal meets the variance standards, when applying the three conditions:

## a) Will the proposal relieve practical difficulties that prevent a reasonable use from complying with the ordinance requirements?

Yes. Reasonable use does not mean that the applicant must show the land cannot be put to any reasonable use without the variance. Rather, the applicant must show that there are practical difficulties in complying with the code and that the proposed use is reasonable. "Practical difficulties" may include functional and aesthetic concerns.

The practical difficulty is caused by the unique shape of the existing lot with access available from two streets (McCauley Terrace and McCauley Circle.) Additional difficulties include the steep slopes toward Arrowhead Lake. The proposal to split the lot is reasonable in the context of the neighborhood which includes a wide variety of lot shapes and sizes, and the appearance of a vacant lot off McCauley Terrace where the second home would be located. The first home would gain access off McCauley Circle, as the current home does. The second home would gain access off McCauley Terrace. Two homes have access off the
street that are more narrow than proposed Lot 2. 6449 McCauley Terrace is 21.47 feet and 6445 McCauley Terrace is 25.5 feet.
b) There are circumstances that are unique to the property, not common to every similarly zoned property, and that are not self-created?

The circumstances that are unique to this property, the size and shape of the lot with access to two different streets is unique to the property and was not created by the applicant.

## c) Will the variance alter the essential character of the neighborhood?

No. The proposed improvements requested by the variance would not alter the essential character of the neighborhood. Two new single-family homes would be constructed on lots similar in size to the lots in the neighborhood. The current lot is larger than most lots in this neighborhood. The impact to the lot on McCauley Circle will be the same as a tear down and rebuild.

## Options for Consideration

## Denial

Recommend the City Council deny the proposed Preliminary Plat with Variances. Denial is based on the following findings:
I. The proposed plat and proposed building pads do not meet the standards outlined in Sec. 32I30. - Considerations as follows:
(I) Whether the physical characteristics of the property, including, without limitation, topography, vegetation, susceptibility to erosion or siltation, susceptibility to flooding, use as a natural recovery and ponding area for storm water, and potential disturbance of slopes with a grade of 18 percent or more, are such that the property is not suitable for the type of development or use proposed.
(2) Whether development within the proposed plat or subdivision will cause the disturbance of more than 25 percent of the total area in such plat or subdivision containing slopes exceeding 18 percent.
(3) Comply with section 10-82.
2. Development of the site as proposed would be harmful to adjacent properties.
3. Proposed lots do not meet the City's lot size requirements for lot width, area and depth.
4. The building pads and drainage areas would have a negative impact to existing trees and steep slopes.

## Approval

Recommend the City Council approve the proposed Preliminary Plat with the Lot Area, Width and Depth Variances. Approval is based on the following findings:

1. Lots within this area have a wide variety of shapes and sizes.
2. The proposed lots are generally similar in size and shape to other lots within this area, including width at the street.
3. The existing lot is the largest in the area.
4. The lots on McCauley Terrace are all irregular in shape. There appears to be a vacant lot on McCauley Terrace, as the existing lot gains vehicular access off McCauley Circle.
5. Upon compliance with all city and watershed district requirements for grading and drainage, the proposed subdivision would not have a negative impact on adjacent property.
6. The practical difficulty is caused by the size and shape of the existing lot with access available from two streets (McCauley Terrace and McCauley Circle.) Additional difficulties include the steep slopes toward Arrowhead Lake.
7. The proposal to split the lot is reasonable in the context of the neighborhood which includes a wide variety of lot shapes and sizes, and the appearance of a vacant lot off McCauley Terrace where the second home would be located.

Approval is subject to the following conditions:
I. The City must approve the final plat within one year of preliminary approval or receive a written application for a time extension or the preliminary approval will be void. Final plat shall include a complete grading and drainage plan subject to review and approval of the city engineer. The grading and drainage plans must be revised to meet the conditions required herein.
2. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the following items must be submitted:
a. Park dedication fee of $\$ 5,000$ must be paid.
b. A construction management plan for the construction of each home.
c. Submit evidence of a Nine Mile Creek Watershed District approval. The City may require revisions to the preliminary plat to meet the district's requirements.
d. Curb-cut permits must be obtained from the Edina engineering department. Driveway plans must be consistent with the proposed grading plan to preserve as many trees as possible.
e. Individual homes must comply with the overall grading plan for the site. Each individual building permit will be reviewed for compliance with the overall grading plan and development agreement subject to review and approval of the city engineer.
f. Utility hook-ups are subject to review of the city engineer.
g. There shall be no increase in peak rate or volume to neighboring private property.
h. Any disturbance to the roadway caused by the construction of the new homes must be repaired by replacing the asphalt pavement from curb-to-curb and from saw-cut to saw-cut.
3. Compliance with the newly adopted tree ordinance, and replacement trees should be planted on site.

## Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends approval of the proposed Subdivision and Variances, subject to the findings and conditions listed above.
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Dear Neighbor,

I am writing to you in regards to the property located at 6416 Mccauley Circle, Edina, MN 55439. I recently purchased this lot with the intent to develop new housing opportunities. I am working with the city of Edina to subdivide the lot and build two single family homes. It is very important to me to gain the approval of the residents in the neighborhood for this project. I do believe this development will be an advantage for the surrounding home values. Given the potential impact on the neighborhood, I had the opportunity to speak to Tom McCauley whose grandfather built the home. He is enthusiastic about the new opportunity taking place on McCauley Circle. I am taking the time to inform the residents in the area of this plan and to get a response before moving forward with applying for the permits.

Please call/text me to 763-222-7837 or email me - dipendra.mahaseth@gmail.com if you object to the subdivision of 6416 Mccauley Circle or if you simply have questions or concerns. Gathering your input now will help me to better plan this project and prevent issues that might arise in the future. By signing below, you approve the subdivision of the address/lot located at 6416 Mccauley Circle, Edina, MN 55439 into two lots with variances. I appreciate your time and support.

Kind Regards,
Dipendra Mahaseth
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August 3rd, 2022

Dear Neighbor,

I am writing to you in regards to the property located at 6416 Mccauley Circle, Edina, MN 55439. I recently purchased this lot with the intent to develop new housing opportunities. I am working with the city of Edina to subdivide the lot and build two single family homes. It is very important to me to gain the approval of the residents in the neighborhood for this project. I do believe this development will be an advantage for the surrounding home values. Given the potential impact on the neighborhood, I had the opportunity to speak to Tom McCauley whose grandfather built the home. He is enthusiastic about the new opportunity taking place on MoCauley Circle. I am taking the time to inform the residents in the area of this plan and to get a response before moving forward with applying for the permits.

Please call/ text me to 763-222-7837 or email me - dipendra. mahaseth@gmail.com if you object to the subdivision of 6416 Mccauley Circle or if you simply have questions or concerns.
Gathering your input now will help me to better plan this project and prevent issues that might arise in the future. By signing below, you approve the subdivision of the address lot located at 6416 Mccauley Circle, Edina, MN 55439 into two lots with variances. I appreciate your time and support.

Kind Regards,
Dipendra Mahaseth
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## History of Similar Requests

History of Recent Subdivisions with Variances
2006, the property at 5901 France Avenue received variances to build four (4) 66 -foot wide lots In 2006 , the property at 59 France Avenue received variances
consistent with the area. (Median $=9,269$ s.f. \& 73 feet wide.)
2. In 2008,6120 Brookview Avenue was proposed to be divided into two (2) 50 -foot lots; however, the applicant withdrew the request before action was taken. (Median $=6,700$ s.f. \& 50 feet wide.)
3. In 2009, a 100 -foot lot at 5920 Oaklawn was granted variances to divide into two (2) 50 -foot lots. (Median $=6,699$ s.f. \& 50 feet wide.)
4. In 2011 , the property at 5829 Brookview was granted variances to divide into two (2) 50 -foot lots. (Median $=6,769$ s.f. \& 50 feet wide.)
5. In 2012 , the property at 6109 Oaklawn was denied the request to subdivide the property into two (2) 50 foot lots. (Median =6,701 s.f. \& 50 feet wide.)
6. In 2012,6120 Brookview was again proposed for subdivision. That request was denied. (Median $=6,700$ s.f. \& 50 feet wide.)
7. In 2012,5945 Concord was denied the request to subdivide the property into two (2) 50 -foot lots. (Median $=10,028$ s.f. \& 77 feet wide.)
8. In 2015 , a 100 -foot lot at 5825 Ashcroft Avenue was granted variances to divide into two (2) 50 -foot lots (Median $=6,790$ s.f. \& 50 feet wide.)

9 In 2015, 5945 Concord was approved for a request to subdivide the property into two (2) 50 -foot lots. (Median $=10,028$ s.f. \& 77 feet wide.)
10. In 2016,5845 Kellogg Avenue was denied a request to subdivide the property into two (2) 50 -foot lots.
(Median $=6,715$ s.f. \& 50 feet wide.)
II. In 2017, 6124 Ewing Avenue was approved for a request to subdivide into two (2) lots with lot width and area variances. (Median $=11,500$ s.f. \& 80 feet wide.)
12. In 2017, 5404 Park Place was approved for a request to subdivide into two (2) lots with lot width variances from 75 feet to 65 feet for each lot; and lot area variances from 9,000 square feet to 8,705 and 8,840 square feet. (Median $=8,107$ s.f. \& width was 60 feet wide.
13. In 2019, 5841 Oaklawn was approved for a request to subdivide into two (2) lots with lot width variances from 75 feet to 50 feet for one lot; and lot area variances from 9,000 square feet to 8,793 and 6,694 square feet.
14. In 2019,4625 Lexington was approved for a request to subdivide into two (2) lots with lot width variance from 75 feet to 60 feet for both lots, and lot area variances from 9,306 square feet to 8,106 and 8,128 square feet. (Median area - 9,306 square feet, median lot depth - 135 feet, and the median lot width 68 feet)
15. In 2020,5928 Ashcroft was denied a request to subdivide into two (2) lots with lot width variances from 75 feet to 50 feet for both lots, and lot area variances from 9,000 square feet to 6,813 and 6,790 squar feet. (Median area - 8,84I s.f., median lot depth - 135 and median width was 66 feet.)


The CITY of EDINA

16. In 2020, 5928 Abbott Avenue was approved for a two-lot subdivision with lot width variances from 75 feet to 50 feet for both lots, lot area variance from 9,000 square feet to 6,391 and 6,331 square feet, and lot depth variances from 135 feet to 127 feet for both lots. (Median lot area - 6,745 square feet, median lot depth - 129.9 feet, and the median lot width -50 feet.)
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Lot Sizes on McCauley Circle

## Survey Responses

## Public Hearing Comments-6416 McCauley Circle

## Better Together Edina

Project: Public Hearing: 6416 McCauley Circle Subdivision



Respondent No: 1
Login: Anonymous
Email: n/a

Responded At: Oct 10, 2022 15:19:50 pm Last Seen: $\quad$ Oct 10, 2022 15:19:50 pm IP Address: n/a

Q1. First and Last Name

Q2. Address

Safath Zaman

12718 huntington avenue, savage, mn 55378

Q3. Comment
This project is good, I support the development. This will make the community look better.


## Q3. Comment

Love seeing projects come to life and stand in support of the growth. I absolutely see this as something amazing for the community and what it will bring. This will be the housing of two more wonderful additions to an already wonderful neighborhood.

Q1. First and Last Name

Q2. Address

Bishal Maharjan

12889 Oliver Ave S, Burnsville MN 55337

## Q3. Comment

I am sure Dipendra has a plan for maximum use of his land to further develop his property and overall community.


Respondent No: 4
Login: Anonymous
Email: n/a

Responded At: Oct 10, 2022 18:32:41 pm Last Seen: Oct 10, 2022 18:32:41 pm IP Address: n/a

Q1. First and Last Name

Q2. Address

Nicholas walsh

15565 Cherry path

Q3. Comment
Great addition to the neighborhood


Q1. First and Last Name

Q2. Address

Espinoza

Gallagher Dr Edina, Mn 55435

Q3. Comment
Developing two new homes to the community allows for an amazing project to come to life. Let's welcome our new neighbors to the block!


Q1. First and Last Name

Q2. Address

Q3. Comment

Bryce Crowley

5400 Vernon Ave S, Edina, MN

Looks like a great project!


Responded At: Oct 11, 2022 18:26:04 pm Last Seen: Oct 11, 2022 18:26:04 pm IP Address: n/a

Q1. First and Last Name

Q2. Address

Q3. Comment
I support this project.

Michael Sauro

5400 Vernon Ave Edina MN, 55436


Q1. First and Last Name

Q2. Address
Ayushma Shrestha

12929 Arbor Lakes Parkway North, Maple Grove, MN, 55369

Q3. Comment
The project looks well planned.


Q1. First and Last Name

Q2. Address

Andrew W

2776 Casco Point rd. Wayzata

Q3. Comment
I think this is will be a good addition to the nieghborbood!


Q1. First and Last Name

Q2. Address

Brianna Olsen

315 1st Ave NE Minneapolis mn

Q3. Comment
Dipendra is a good friend of mine and I think he has a great vision for this project. I am looking forward to seeing him turn the run-down lot into something beautiful. He has even spoken w/ the Mccauley family and they are on-board! It will be a benefit for the surrounding neighbors as well as the city! Please approve this permit!

```
Responded At: Oct 13, 2022 09:48:47 am Last Seen: Oct 13, 2022 09:48:47 am IP Address: n/a
```

| Q1. First and Last Name | Lindsay Melander |
| :--- | :--- |
| Q2. Address | 6453 McCauley Terrace |

Q3. Comment

With multiple families on McCauley Terrace that have young children we are extremely concerned about the traffic safety. All of our lots are sloped and thus have minimal yard playing space. Therefore the kids play in the cul de sac. We all know to watch for them but adding another driveway on the curve makes it challenging to see kids zipping down on a bike or running after a ball. Also street parking is already a challenge when a neighbor has guests so this would add to that. Lastly snow removal may become more cumbersome seeing as that area was used as a dumping spot for snow by the city. We now may require more truck snow removal with this addition so it doesn't pile up and trickle down as it melts seeing as we are all on sloped lots. Thank you for your consideration.

| Q1. First and Last Name | Josephine Ann Parker |
| :--- | :--- |
| Q2. Address | 6439 McCauley Terrace |

Q3. Comment
Having reconsider my original approval, I don't believe there is sufficient space for two homes. One very small lot next to my property and the other lot looks okay. The home coming off McCauley Terrace has no place to park other than in their driveway or in front of my property. We have a parking problem as it is and do not need additional cars. The only place for our children to ride their bikes and scooter's is in the circle. We have no sidewalks or trails on McCauley Terrace, McCauley Circle, or McCauley Trail. I believe one house on one lot.


Q1. First and Last Name

Q2. Address

Q3. Comment
I support his request to subdivide his property.


Q1. First and Last Name

Q2. Address

Marinna McDermott

436 Buchanan St NE Minnespolis, MN 55413

Q3. Comment
This subdivision is a great plan in a wonderful, sought after location in Edina. Only benefits the city by adding another single family home on the lake!


Q1. First and Last Name

Q2. Address

Kristen Halen

6438 Regency Ln, Eden Prairie, MN 55344

Q3. Comment
Very logical idea for this wonderful property. I like to see that Mr. Mahaseth is very transparent with the neighbors. Overall great opportunity for the city of Edina.


Q1. First and Last Name

Q2. Address

Rebecca Ghiselli

4246 Alden Dr, Edina, MN 55416

Q3. Comment
I support this new project. We would like to see new buildings in our well-maintained community.

Q1. First and Last Name

Q2. Address

Claire parmenter

6443 McCauley terrace, Edina

## Q3. Comment

We are very concerned about the proposed devision of the 6416 McCauley circle lot. It is directly next to our home. We are worried about how close the new house would be to ours. The lots in our neighborhood are not huge, but also not small and it would significantly change the look and feel of our house to have another house so close. In addition, it would add increased traffic to our already crowded cul-de-sac (McCauley terrace). We are a small street with only 8 houses, it is our side (not the more populated McCauley circle side) that will be affected by the addition of the driveway and house. We hope our voices will be heard even though there are fewer of us. The lot he is proposing to divide is not large and the division will make two incredibly narrow lots. In fact, the current, very tiny cabin, would not fit on the proposed new lot. This is not something that will improve our neighborhood.


Q1. First and Last Name

Q2. Address

William Schneider

6085 Lincoln Dr, Edina, MN, 55436

Q3. Comment
This might help bring more residents to community.


Q1. First and Last Name
Michael schrom

Q2. Address
6410 Mccauley circle Edina Mn. 55439

Q3. Comment
Live and let live

Q1. First and Last Name

Q2. Address

Tom McCauley

6447 McCauley Terrace

Q3. Comment
I believe Dipendra Mahaseth's plan to subdivide and build two custom single family homes will enhance the value of the neighborhood.


Q1. First and Last Name

Q2. Address

David NeIson

6411 McCauley Circle

## Q3. Comment

I strongly oppose the subdivision of this property. Way too much house and structure - will change nature of neighborhood and too dense as a neighbor.


Q1. First and Last Name

Q2. Address

Samir Bhattarai

Boston, MA

Q3. Comment
This will be beautiful properties. I can feel it. Good luck and hope for smooth completion of the project.

Responded At: Oct 20, 2022 08:13:59 am Last Seen: $\quad$ Oct 20, 2022 08:13:59 am IP Address: n/a

## Q1. First and Last Name

## Stephanie Nelson

Q2. Address
6411 McCauley Circle, Edina MN. 55439

## Q3. Comment

I oppose the subdivision request for 6416 McCauley Circle made by Dipendra Mahaseth, as the next door neighbor of this property and resident of 6411 McCauley Circle since 2009. I have been a homeowner and resident of Edina since 1995. I understand that there is a shortage of affordable housing but I do not think that dividing a 83 ' lot into two +3100 square foot homes qualifies as such. As of October 20, there were nine homes for sale, of new construction and between 3000-4000 square feet, with an average price of $\$ 1,240,010$. This is a business plan on the part of Mr. Mahaseth, to request a subdivision and build two homes on a site that can support one home. When Mr. Mahaseth tried to get my husband's support and signature, he was accompanied by a woman he introduced as his "business partner," further evidence that this is a business plan on his part. I oppose the subdivision for the environmental effects it will have on the surrounding area. Construction of two homes will increase run-off into the lake, increase erosion of the steep slope, and remove at least three mature oak trees from the property, reducing shade and increasing energy costs. Building two homes on this property will reduce vegetation and cover used by wildlife, including deer, foxes, coyotes, rabbits, wood ducks, and pileated woodpeckers. Fencing of the property will reduce natural movements of wildlife. The construction entrance on McCauley Circle may cause harm to the mature maple on our property. I also believe that Mr. Mahaseth is misrepresenting the support of the neighborhood both in how the signatures were obtained and in the number of signatures. He wrote in his applicant narrative that it was important to gain the approval of the residents in the neighborhood. I find it questionable that eleven of the 26 signatures were obtained when he showed up at the Neighborhood Night Out Celebration on August 3rd, both at the start of the celebration then after returning later in the evening as the celebration was winding down. Additionally, seven of the 26 of the signatures are from residents outside of the 500 foot property radius indicated on the submitted plat. Two of the 26 signatures are from the rental tenants of 6414 and 6412 McCauley Circle, rather than from the actual owner and landlord of the property. When I met Mr. Mahaseth in August, I welcomed him to the neighborhood and we chatted about his plans for the new house. Mr. Mahaseth stated that he would not be there for at least a year while the building took place. At no point in this conversation did he mention he would be requesting a subdivision nor did he seek to gain my support in this. I also find it curious that the application is missing the signatures of 2 of the four neighboring residents, whose homes will be directly affected by this subdivision. Mr. Mahaseth wrote in his applicant narrative that he had gained the support of Tom McCauley, the grandson of Mr. John McCauley, the original owner of the home. I recall that when Mr. McCauley passed away in 2010, his family also sought a subdivision with variances but were denied. I hope that the Planning Commission will deny this request for a subdivision as well.

Q1. First and Last Name

Q2. Address

Louise Segreto

6720 Indian Hills Road, Edina, MN. 55439

## Q3. Comment

I have no objection to the Subdivision as proposed, but would like to pass on one concern to the developer and the City of Edina: Arrowhead Lake is already suffering from a number of issues affecting water quality. Every home that has shoreline on the Lake can help contribute to helping with Lake water quality. Although there is currently no minimum buffer requirement under City Ordinance for maintaining vegetation between the Lake and home landscaping, it sure would be helpful if Mr. Mahaseth would consider not planting grass to the Lake's edge in favor of natural native landscaping that would help with filtration, nutrient runoff and wildlife habitat. Contacting 9 Mile Creek Watershed District would be a great resource for him to contact to get some information and potentially even a grant to explore options.

## McCauley Terrace
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## McCauley Circle
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[^0]:    Proposed North Pentagon Park
    Remaining Gateway Area
    Source: Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition

[^1]:    Source: WSB \& Associates, Inc.
    Note: Based upon criteria shown in Figure 16

